

IELTS

Writing Guidance

This Book Will Enhance Your Skill for Writing Tasks

WHY TO CHOOSE THIS BOOK?

- More Examples
- Result Oriented
- Familiar Topics
- Guarantee For 9 Bands

**Take
to the
Height**

Saeed Ahmad Saeedy

169 IELTS ESSAY SAMPLES

EDUCATION

1. As **computers** are being used more and more in education, there will be soon no role for **teachers** in the classroom.

There have been **immense advances in technology** in most aspects of people's lives, especially in the field of education. **Nowadays**, an increasing number of students rely on computers to research for information and to produce a perfect paper for school purposes. Others have decided to leave the original way of learning to get knowledge through online schools. These changes in the learning process have brought a special concern regarding the possible decrease of importance of teachers in the classroom.

Some people believe the role of teachers **started to fade** because computers have been helping some students **to progress** in their studies quicker than when compared with an original classroom. **For example**, in the same classroom, students have different **intellectual capacities**, thus some would be tied to a slow advance in their studies because of others' incapacity of understanding. **In this way**, pupils could progress in their **acquisition** of knowledge at their own pace using computers instead of learning from teachers.

However, the **presence of a teacher** is essential for students because the human contact influences them in positive ways. Firstly, students realize that they are not dealing with a machine but with a human being who deserves attention and respect. They also learn the importance of studying in group and respect other students, which helps them to improve their social skills.

Moreover, teachers are required in the learning process because they **acknowledge** some **student's deficiencies** and help them to solve their problems by repeating the same explanation, giving extra exercises or even suggesting a private tutor. **Hence**, students can have a bigger chance not to fail in a subject.

In conclusion, the role for teachers in the learning process is still very important and it will continue to be in the future because no machine can replace the human interaction and its consequences.

Sample 2 :

Nobody can argue that the acquisition of knowledge is more fun and easier with computers. The mere activity of touching and exploring this device constitutes an enjoyable task for a kid. This, accompanied with the relaxing attitude and software interactivity, usually conduce to a better **grasping of new knowledge**. At a higher



educational level; the availability of digital books, simulator and other academic materials, provide the student with an ever accessible source of information, that otherwise would not be at hand.

But, besides the increasing complexity and behavior of intelligent software, which is usually embedded in the academic digital material, the need of human interaction in the learning process will always be present, at least in the foreseeable future. There is the necessity for a human being to be able to determine what the specific needs of each individual are. The expertise of a teacher in how to explain and adapt complex concepts to different individuals can hardly be mimicked by a computer, no matter how sophisticated its software is.

As computers are becoming a common tool for teaching, teachers should be more aware of their role as guides in the acquisition of knowledge rather than transmitters of facts. They have to be open minded to the changes that are taking place, keep updated and serve as a problem solvers in the learning process, thus allowing students to discover the fact for themselves.

To summarize, in my personal view, teachers play and will() play an important role in the classroom, especially at the primary level. No matter how complex computers become, there will be no replacement for the human interaction, but in the way how this interaction takes place.

Excellent essay! Are you a native English speaker? Well done. The only problem: too long, 365 words instead of 250-265 maximum.

**2. In some countries young people are encouraged to work or travel for a year between finishing high school and starting university studies.
Discuss the advantages and disadvantages for young people who decide to do this.**

It is quite common these days for young people in many countries to have a break from studying after graduating from high school. This trend is not restricted to rich students who have the money to travel, but is also evident among poorer students who choose to work and become economically independent for a period of time.

The reasons for this trend may involve the recognition that a young adult who passes directly from school to university is rather restricted in terms of general knowledge and experience of the world. By contrast, those who have spent some time earning a living or traveling to other places have a broader view of life and better personal resources to draw on. They tend to be more independent, which is a very important factor in academic study and research, as well as giving them an advantage in terms of coping with the challenges of student life.

However, there are certainly dangers in taking time off at that important age. Young adults may end up never returning to their studies or finding it difficult to readapt to an academic environment. They may think that it is better to continue in a particular job, or to do something completely different from a university course. But overall, I think this is less likely today, when academic qualifications are essential for getting a reasonable career.

My view is that young people should be encouraged to broaden their horizons. That is the best way for them to get a clear perspective of what they are hoping to do with their lives

and why. Students with such a perspective are usually the most effective and motivated ones and taking a year off may be the best way to gain this.

(291 words)

3. Some people believe that a college or university education should be available to all students. Others believe that higher education should be available only to good students.

Discuss these views. Which view do you agree with? Explain why.

People learn through their entire lives. They constantly improve their knowledge and develop. I think that a college or university education should be available to all students because every person has the right to choose the way to self-perfection. Bellow I will give some of my reasons to support my position.

First of all, every person should have the chance to get a higher degree, gain new knowledge and experience. However, some people believe that higher education should be available only to good students. I think it is silly. It is like to make unavailable traveling for one who does not have IQ high enough.

Second of all, some young people do not do well at school but they have great personality and ability to learn. They are self-confident, persistent and patient. With these qualities they can get higher grades then their classmates who are talented but lazy. Imagine for example situation when a teenager gets high grades because his or her parents constantly make him or her study and help to do most of the homework. In this case a child does very well at school but I think a college can show the opposite results.

Finally, it is a discrimination against students to make available higher education only for good ones.

So, if a student does poor and gets low grades he/she should be sent down. But if a person was never given a chance to try himself/herself at college, what to do in this case?

To sum up, I think that all young people should have the chance to get a higher education. To take or not this chance must be up to them.

(277 words)

4. Some people believe that the best way of learning about life is by listening to the advice of family and friends. Other people believe that the best way of learning about life is through personal experience. Compare the advantages of these two different ways of learning about life. Which do you think is preferable? Use specific examples to support your preference.

From my everyday experience and observation I can stand that the best way of learning about life is through personal experience. However, some people think that it is wiser to learn about life through listening to the advice of family and friends. It does not mean I totally disagree with this way of learning. Moreover, I think that it is wise for a person to take an intermediate position because each of these ways has its own advantages. Bellow I will give my reasons to support my point of view.

From the one side, learning through one's personal experience brings many benefits. First of all, scientists say that personal experience has greater impact on a person. I have to agree with this. Take for example children. They will not believe their parents that something can hurt them until they try it and make sure in it. Furthermore, most likely they

will remember this experience longer. **Second of all**, people learn how to **analyze their mistakes**, make conclusions and next time try to avoid them. So, I think it is a great experience that makes people stronger, more **self-confident** and **persistent**. They gain more knowledge and experience that will be very helpful and valuable in the future.

From the other side, listening to the advice of family and friends brings many benefits too. Parents with great patience **pass down their knowledge and experience** to their children. They teach them all they know and they want their children do not make the same mistakes. **In addition to** those practical benefits, learning from someone's advice is **painless**. For example, parents nowadays very often talk to their children about drugs. I think it is a great example when one should not try drugs in order to gain new experience. I think it is a case when children must trust their parents.

To sum up, I think it is wise to combine both of these ways to learn and try to analyze personal mistakes as well as not personal. I think together they can greatly simplify one's life and make the way to success shorter.

(350 words)

5. With the pressures on today's young people to succeed academically, some people believe that **non-academic subjects at school (eg: physical education and cookery) should be **removed** from the syllabus so that children can **concentrate wholly** on academic subjects.**

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

What young people should study at school has long been the **subject of intense debate** and this is a question that certainly does not have one correct answer.

We need to provide young people the best possible chance of doing well at school. In traditional curriculum there is **a wide variety of subjects** with a mix of academic and non-academic subjects. In this way a young person is formed with a rounded education. Non-academic subjects would include sports, cooking, woodwork and metalwork. I believe this is the best form of education. A young person should learn things other than academic subjects. Sport is particularly important. Young people have to learn to love sport so that they can be fit and healthy later in life. If not we will be raising an obese and unfit generation.

I totally understand the point of view that education is so important that students must be pushed as hard as possible to **achieve their best**. It sounds a good idea to only expose the students to academic subjects as then they can spend all of their school hours on studying areas that will get them into university and good jobs later in life. I just feel a more rounded education would produce a better individual. We must remember too that a lot of people, maybe even most people, aren't academically minded and would benefit more from a more **vocationally** based education. Forcing academic studies onto them would lead to failure and the student leaving school too early.

Therefore I agree that although a wholly **academic curriculum** would suit and benefit some young people, I believe that for most students non-academic subjects are important inclusions still in today's syllabuses.

6. In many countries, sports and exercise classes are replaced with the academic subjects. Discuss the effects of this trend.

Over the past few decades, academic subjects have become increasingly important in this fast-changing information-based society. Nowadays, there has been a growing debate as to whether it would be more effective to replace physical education classes with academic subjects. Despite the importance of sports, I highly believe that it is inevitable and more efficient to focus more on academic subjects for several reasons.

Those who argue that sports and exercise classes are needed in school base their case on the following arguments. First of all, sports are a good way to build character and develop personality. That is, there are necessary for learning about competition, cooperation, and good sportsmanship. In addition, as a majority of children these days are addicted to the Internet, they find it hard to leave their computer. Consequently, a growing number of children are becoming overweight or obese due to a lack of exercise. So, if schools foster an environment that deprives students of getting a proper physical education, it will have a long-term negative effect on children both mentally and physically.

Nevertheless, people should not ignore the fact that devoting more time and energy to academic subjects will benefit students more in the long run. The time devoted to physical education now would be better spent teaching students English. This is because speaking fluent English will give young people an advantage over other college applicants and job seekers in the near future. Besides, science will undoubtedly benefit youth more than physical education as well. The principles learned in science will provide the necessary foundation for solving and difficult problems that are sure to arise in students' futures.

In summary, there are high hopes that educators and parents exercise wisdom in teaching young generations.

(300 words)

128 Some people say that physical exercise should be a required part of every school day. Other people believe that students should spend the whole school day on academic studies. Which opinion do you agree with? Use specific reasons and details to support your answer.

Although honesty, *intelligence*, and *a sense* of humor are all worthwhile characteristics, I feel the most important one in life to have is sensitivity. A sensitive person is aware of him/herself and the way their actions affect others. A sensitive person knows the place of honesty, intelligence, and a sense of humor.

Honesty is not always the best policy. There is such a thing as a white lie. You don't want to insult someone by saying that their new dress doesn't fit properly or that you wouldn't live in their new house if they paid you. You must be sensitive to when it is necessary to tell the truth and when it is better to tell a white lie.

Intelligence is a wonderful thing to have, but not all intelligent people use their intelligence sensitively. You don't want to show off and make others feel stupid. You must be sensitive to the reactions of the people around you. It might be appropriate for you to admit that you have the

right answer, but in some cases, you might have to say, "I think this is the answer, but we might want to check it." A sensitive person would not make someone else look dumb.

A sense of humor is always valued. Different people, however, laugh at different things. You don't want to make someone feel uncomfortable by laughing at his/her mistakes. A sensitive person would understand whether a person could be teased or whether a person would appreciate a certain joke.

A sensitive person would make everyone feel comfortable. A sensitive person understands that people are different and that the values of honesty, intelligence and humor can be applied differently.

##

While physical exercise is important, I do not believe that it is the school's responsibility to provide physical training for its students. That is something that everyone can take care of on his or her own.

Many students get plenty of physical exercise as part of their daily life or recreation. A student

who bicycles ten miles to and from school does not need more exercise. A good physical education program must take a student's outside activity into consideration. Otherwise, some students will spend valuable class hours repeating physical exercise.

If a school offers such activities, it also suggests that students will be graded on them. The range

of possible physical activities is great: football, swimming, weight lifting, ballet, ballroom dance,

yoga, skiing, horseback riding, and golf are just a few. However, the number that a school could

offer is small. Some students could get bad grades in physical education simply because the school

could not provide an activity they enjoy or do well. This seems unfair. Research suggests that participation, not excellence, in these activities determines the physical benefits the body will get.

Another issue is economic. Many schools do not have the money to provide gym facilities, playing

fields, and athletic equipment for their students. Other schools are located in cities where that kind

of space just isn't available. A few schools would rather keep money for academic purposes.

Schools can certainly encourage physical activity. They can provide space for notices about activities, events, and classes for physical activities. They can encourage students to plan time away from academic studies to get some exercise. However, I think that providing exercise should

not be the school's responsibility.

7. Some people think high school graduates should travel or work for a period of time instead of going directly to study at university. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of both approaches.

Give reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own knowledge or experience.

High school students face many decisions as they prepare to graduate, including what they are going to do after graduation. Some high school students go directly to college or university after graduation. Others prefer to travel or work for some time before going to university.

For those who choose to go college or university after graduation, there are advantages and disadvantages. One of the big advantages of going directly from high school to college is that you are still in the habit of studying. By going to college after graduation, you do not lose the study skills that you developed during high school. The big disadvantages, however, is that you may not be ready for college. You may not know exactly what you want to study, or you may be more interested in freedom and parties than in your courses. At that age, it is often difficult for students to take on the responsibilities of college.

There are also advantages and disadvantages to working or traveling before starting college. Working or traveling allows you a better idea of what you want to do with your life. You gain practical experience that helps you define what you want to study. You also are well prepared for the responsibilities of college or university studies. On the other hand, by the time you start college, you will probably have obligations, like a job or spouse, which keep you from focusing on studies. In addition, travelling or working before college may cause you to spend enough time out of school that you forget how to study.

The decision of what to do after high school graduation can be a difficult one. Deciding whether to go straight into college or university or take time to work or travel is something that faces every high school student. After thinking about the advantages and disadvantages of both options, the decision should be based on what is best for you.

8. The student who study from the school to university get benefit less and contribute less too, than those of student who go to travel or job and get skills and experience before going high. Do you agree or disagree?

Nowadays, in our competitive world, to succeed, knowledge from school and university is not enough. Therefore, the student who study from the school to university get benefit less and contribute less too, than those of student who go to travel or job and get experience and skills before going high. There are two following reasons to prove for my opinion. I call the group of people who study from school to university is group A and the other group is group B.

Firstly, at school and university, what group A gain is almost theory, theory and theory. Of course, theory is very necessary, however, you can't do everything with theory. You must have practiceable experience. This is what group A lack very much. Although in the third or fourth year at university, group A can be apprentices in some companies, to help them approach their future jobs, they aren't trained well because of short time. And the real job is still very strange with them. After graduating, without experience, group A can't accomplish their work perfectly. On the other hand, it takes them time and money to keep up with other experienced ones and may be scorned. Therefore, group A can contribute less than group B who have the most two important things: skills and experience.

Secondly, as group A contributes less, they surely get less benefit. Moreover, many companies which employ people in group A have to train them from the back-ground.

These companies take this cost from group A's salary to get rid of the fact that their employees may leave after being trained to other companies. So, less benefit is unavoidable and certain, Whereas group B are more loyal and effective workers. They also have useful experience and skills. Besides, their education is the same as or even higher than group A. As the result, group B get more benefit absolutely.

In conclusion, I think student should go to travel or job before going high. Therefore, they can't only have basic knowledge but also skills and experience which are useful for them to get a good job and a brilliant future.

This essay is too long (350 words instead of 250). To fight this problem, try to write more in general and provide fewer details. The language and ideas are good and so is the essay's structure. Looks like Band 7 to me.

9. Disruptive school students have a negative influence on others. Students who are noisy and disobedient should be grouped together and taught separately. Do you agree or disagree?

There is no doubt that some students in schools behave badly and their behaviour causes difficulty for others either because it has a negative effect on the group or because ordinary students find it difficult to study with them.

One solution is to take these students away and teach them on their own. However, if we simply have them removed after one or two warnings, we are limiting their educational opportunities because it seems to me that a school which caters for difficult students is a sort of "prison" whatever name you give it and the people who go there may never recover from the experience. This can then cause problems for the wider society.

Perhaps we need to look at why the disruptive students behave badly before we separate them. Disruptive students may be very intelligent and find the classes boring because the work is too easy. Perhaps these students need extra lessons rather than separate lessons. Or perhaps the teachers are uninspiring and this results in behavioural problems so we need better teachers. On the other hand, most students put up with this situation rather than cause trouble, and some people argue that we have to learn to suffer bad teachers and boring situations and that students who can't learn this lesson need to be taught separately.

So before we condemn the students to a special school, we should look at factors such as the teaching, because once the children have been separated, it is very unlikely that they will be brought back.

10. Some people think that universities should not provide so much theoretical knowledge but give more practical training throughout their courses. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

In the past, a majority of academics have held the opinion that universities should only offer a theoretically-based approach to teaching throughout their courses, as opposed to the more recent trend towards empirical acquisition of knowledge involving more “hands on” experience. Is this the most effective way for students to learn vital academic information while undertaking their degrees? Undoubtedly, advantages and disadvantages of both academic learning styles have to be evaluated.

Firstly, on the one hand, despite being the more traditional educational approach, learning from theory in relevant academic discourses to identify established knowledge allows us to gain a professional insight. For example, students can easily identify facts and opinions from past discourses. In addition, students acquire knowledge more easily when given relative theoretical examples to build upon. For instance, in subjects such as history or sociology, studying textbook examples allows students to unravel complex academic theories which they could expand on. Alternatively, there are some disadvantages for students.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that students could find themselves reading tedious and monotonous academic papers. For instance, university degrees involving the evaluation of numerous ‘long-winded’ academic discourses provide little inspiration for students, discouraging enthusiasm. Obviously, interest can be stimulated through empirical research in class. By this I mean that ‘the human brain learns best by doing’. Although time-consuming, there is no substitute for learning from making mistakes.

In conclusion, while both approaches have benefits and drawbacks in our ever-changing academic world, I honestly believe that a more practical approach promotes a stronger acquisition of academic knowledge. In spite of the comprehensive nature which theoretical teaching can possibly provide, practical learning equals more positive learning for future generations.

(280 words)

**11. People attend college or university for many different reasons (for example, new experiences, career preparation, increased knowledge).
Why do you think people attend college or university?**

People attend college for a lot of different reasons. I believe that the three most common reasons are to prepare for a career, to have new experiences, and to increase their knowledge of themselves and of the world around them.

Career preparation is probably the primary reason that people attend college. These days, the job market is very competitive. Careers such as information technology will need many new workers in the near future. At college, students can learn new skills for these careers and increase their opportunities for the future.

Students also go to college to have new experiences. For many, it is their first time away from home. At college, they can meet new people from many different places. They can see what life is like in a different city. They can learn to live on their own and take care of themselves without having their family always nearby.

At college, students have the opportunity to increase their knowledge. As they decide what they want to study, pursue their studies, and interact with their classmates, they learn a lot about themselves. They also, of course, have the opportunity to learn about many subjects in their classes. In addition to the skills and knowledge related to their career, college students also have the chance to take classes in other areas. For many, this will be their last chance to study different subjects.

Colleges offer much more than career preparation. They offer the opportunity to have new experiences and to learn many kinds of things. I think all of these are reasons why people attend college.

Sample 2:

People attend colleges or universities for a lot of different reasons. I believe that the three most common reasons are to prepare for a career, to have new experiences, and to increase their knowledge of themselves and the world around them.

Career preparation is becoming more and more important to young people. For many, this is the primary reason to go to college. They know that the job market is competitive. At college, they can learn new skill for careers with a lot of opportunities. This means careers, such as information technology, that are expected to need a large workforce in the coming years.

Also, students go to colleges and universities to have new experiences. This often means having the opportunity to meet people different from those in their hometowns. For most students, going to college is the first time they've been away from home by themselves. In additions, this is the first time they've had to make decisions on their own. Making these decisions increases their knowledge of themselves.

Besides looking for self-knowledge, people also attend a university or college to expand their knowledge in subjects they find interesting. For many, this will be their last chance for a long time to learn about something that doesn't relate to their career.

I would recommend that people not be so focused on a career. They should go to college to have new experiences and learn about themselves and the world they live in.

(243 words)

12. Nowadays, education overseas has become more accessible and growing numbers of people send their offspring to study in other countries. However, this trend has its detractors. I strongly believe that the pros far outweigh the cons, and will examine both below.

One of the greatest advantages is that the children learn to be independent. Having to cook, clean, and pay bills instills this in them. Often they have to work part-time to make ends meet, and this impresses upon them the importance of work and money management.

Another important factor is that these children will be exposed to different cultures and

ways of thinking. They will become more open-minded and tolerant and are likely to become more adaptable individuals.

One of the main motives for sending young people abroad to study is that it enhances their employment prospects. In my experience of living in foreign countries and speaking to various youths, it seems that a foreign education is regarded as something desirable and helpful in getting a decent job. A degree from Britain, for example, is seen as being of a higher standard than one from a developing country. Furthermore, living in a foreign country may lead to fluency in a second language, which is another selling point for prospective employers. In addition, many companies are keen to recruit people with a global outlook.

There are a few drawbacks however. For instance, without parental supervision, the new found freedom children experience may lead to harmful practices such as drug-taking and drinking. Reluctance or inability to reintegrate into their mother country is another. To sum up, it can be seen that the advantages of studying abroad for children are more numerous than the disadvantages. Of course a lot depends on the age of the child, but I believe that for most teenagers it would be a positive experience.

13. It has been said, "Not everything that is learned is contained in books." Compare and contrast knowledge gained from experience with knowledge gained from books. In your opinion, which source is more important? Why?

"Experience is the best teacher" is an old cliché, but I agree with it. We can learn a lot of important things from books, but the most important lessons in life come from our own experiences. Throughout the different stages of life, from primary school to university to adulthood, experience teaches us many skills we need for life.

As children in primary school, we learn facts and information from books, but that is not all we learn in school. On the playground we learn how to make friends. In our class work, we learn how it feels to succeed and what we do when we fail. We start to learn about the things we like to do and the things we don't. We don't learn these things from books, but from our experiences with our friends and classmates.

In our university classes, we learn a lot of information and skills we will need for our future careers, but we also learn a lot that is not in our textbooks. In our daily lives both in class and out of class, we learn to make decisions for ourselves. We learn to take on responsibilities. We learn to get along with our classmates, our roommates, and our workmates. Our successes and failures help us develop skills we will need in our adult lives. They are skills that no book can teach us.

Throughout our adulthood, experience remains a constant teacher. We may continue to read or take classes for professional development. However, our experiences at work, at home, and with our friends teach us more. The triumphs and disasters of our lives teach us how to improve our careers and also how to improve our relationships and how to be the person each one of us wants to be.

Books teach us a lot, but there is a limit to what they teach. They can give us information or show us another person's experiences. These are valuable things, but the lessons we

learn from our own experiences, from childhood through adulthood, are the most important ones we learn.

* People are learning and practicing through their entire life. I believe that life experience and practice are the basic reasons of the humankind's evolution. However, in my opinion, knowledge gained from books plays a very important role in the modern life.

The most obviously important advantage of books is that they hold all knowledge gained by previous generations. People write books about their discoveries and inventions, which are gained through practice and experience. This knowledge is accumulated in books that are passed from generation to generation. So, basically, people get all knowledge about the previous achievements from books, analyze it and then, according to their experience and new data, write new books. In this case, books are the holders of humankind's experience.

For example, at old times people thought that the Earth was flat. It was concluded from observations and studying. However, the next generations, using the experience of their ancestors, proved that the Earth was round.

Personally, I think that books are very important because they are able to give people the basic and fundamental knowledge. Books store history, the important events and discoveries. Without them it is difficult and sometimes impossible to move forward, make new discoveries and inventions.

To summarize, I think a person should take basic knowledge from books because it will help him to make his own inventions, conclusions and discoveries. Only using both books and one's experience one can move forward.

(237 words)

14. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? People should read only those books that are about real events, real people, and established facts. Use specific reasons and details to support your opinion.

Some people think that fiction books have no use at all. They claim that people should read about real events that took place, real people, and established facts. I have to totally disagree with this statement. From my everyday experience and observation I can stand that fiction, miracles and fairy tails are required in our life. For several reasons, which I will mention below, I believe that fiction books play an essential role in our life.

First of all, it is kind of difficult to imagine a six year old child reading about politics or history with the real facts that are not always pleasant. I think that children need miracles and Santa Claus because the real world is too complicated for them. They are too innocent and inexperienced to know the real facts and understand what a real life is about. In addition, I am sure that making a child read only non-fiction books can result in shock.

Second of all, following this statement about refusing from reading books about fiction events we also should refuse from festivals, parades, and celebration such holidays as

Halloween because most of the characters there are fictional. Moreover, comic books will disappear as well as animated films and fiction movies. The disadvantage of non-fiction lies in the facts that nothing happens to excite the mind and spirit. From the other side, fiction provides a great slope for a mind to think creatively.

In conclusion, I think that people need miracles. We can not be satisfied with only naked truth. Human kind must believe in something and this belief helps people break limits and make new inventions.

(273 words)

15. Going overseas for university study is an exciting prospect for many people. But while it may offer some advantages, it is probably better to stay home because of the difficulties a student inevitably encounters living and studying in a different culture. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

There is no doubt that going to study in a foreign country, with its different language and culture, can be a frustrating and sometimes painful experience. But while overseas study has its drawbacks, the difficulties are far outweighed by the advantages. Indeed, people who go abroad for study open themselves up to experiences that those who stay at home will never have.

The most obvious advantage to overseas university study is real-life use of a different language. While a person can study a foreign language in his or her own country, it cannot compare with constant use of the language in academic and everyday life. There is no better opportunity to improve second-language skills than living in the country in which it is spoken. Moreover, having used the language during one's studies offers a distinct advantage when one is applying for jobs back home that require the language.

On a university campus, the foreign student is not alone in having come from far away. He or she will likely encounter many others from overseas and it is possible to make friends from all around the world. This is not only exciting on a social level, but could lead to important overseas contacts in later professional life.

Finally, living and studying abroad offers one a new and different perspective of the world and, perhaps most important, of one's own country. Once beyond the initial shock of being in a new culture, the student slowly begins to get a meaningful understanding of the host society. On returning home, one inevitably sees one's own country in a new, often more appreciative, light.

In conclusion, while any anxiety about going overseas for university study is certainly understandable, it is important to remember that the benefits offered by the experience make it well worthwhile.

16. Many students do not finish school. Why is this, and how can the problem be solved?
School Drop-Outs: Problems and Solutions

Today, although most students in the UAE complete school, a large number still drop out because of family, social and work pressures. This problem requires serious action from both individuals and the government.

Most students who do not complete school do so because of family problems. Girls, especially, want to get married and start a family. Some parents are not interested in education and do not support their children in studying. Social problems are also a contributing factor. Education is compulsory but, despite this, some people do not take it seriously. Furthermore, jobs are available even if students do not have a good education. The third reason is work pressure. Some families are poor and need their children to work in order to increase the income. All these problems will create young people who do not have any skills and who will not be able to improve their lives for the family and the country.

There are several things that can be done about these problems. Parents should be encouraged to send their children to school. Schools with baby-minding facilities should be opened specially for married students. The government needs to stress the importance of education and even offer financial support to students to continue. This will encourage students to stay at school rather than start working.

In conclusion, there are several things that the government can do to allow more people to finish school. However, a number of society attitudes also have to change if the country's young people are to achieve their full potential.

256 words

17. Does a university education lead to success in life?

It is very difficult to answer the claim that a person needs a university education to be successful in life because success in life means different things to different people. This essay starts by defining three different ideas of success. Following this, it looks at which types of success are dependent on a university education.

Success in life can be achieved in different ways. Many magazines and television programmes tell us that success means having a lot of money, having a fulfilling career, and being powerful. In contrast, most religious and spiritual organizations claim that success means finding spiritual happiness and being at peace with God and with yourself. Another idea of success focuses on relationships - being surrounded by people who love you and care about you, spending time with family and friends.

A university education can help you achieve some types of success, but it makes little or no difference to whether or not you are successful in other areas of life. Undoubtedly, a university education is essential if you want to have a career in a profession such as law, engineering, teaching, or medicine. However, you do not need a university degree to become a wealthy and powerful movie star, sports star or businessperson. In fact, a university education does not generally enable you to achieve spiritual happiness, or to have successful relationships with family and friends.

In conclusion, there are many different types of success. A university education may help you to achieve professional success in some careers. However, it will not help you to achieve success in other areas of your life such as your spiritual life or your relationships.

18. Education: Losing its Value

Today, it seems to be universally accepted that increased education is a good thing. Thousands of colleges and millions of students spend vast amounts of time and money chasing pieces of paper. But what is the value of these qualifications? This essay will discuss whether education has been devalued.

Supporters of education (usually teachers or educators, or those who have an interest in stopping people thinking for themselves) say that increased levels of education will open doors for students. Certificates, diplomas, and degrees are held up as a status symbol, a passport to a private club of money and power.

However, the truly powerful are not those who have taken degrees, but people who have stood back and looked at what is really important in life. They have seen opportunity and followed dreams. These people are found in every part of society. Like many brilliant people, Einstein was a weak student at math. Like many successful businessmen, Bill Gates never completed college. Like many inventive and creative people, Edison never went to school. The greatest religious teachers do not have letters after their name, but have looked into their hearts for meaning. Similarly, the world's political leaders do not have master's degrees or doctorates. These are the people who shaped our century, and they are too busy with real life to spend time in the paper chase.

Students in college are being sold an illusion. They are made to believe that self-understanding and society approval will come with the acquisition of a piece of paper. Instead of thinking for themselves, and finding their own personality and strengths, they are fitted like square pegs into round holes.

The role of education is to prepare masses of people to operate at low levels of ability in a very limited and restricted range of activities. Some of these activities are more challenging than perhaps the assembly lines of the past, but still the ultimate purpose is equally uninteresting. More worryingly, despite the increased level of education, people are still not genuinely expected to think for themselves. In fact, the longer years of schooling make the job of brainwashing even easier.

There is still a role for study, research, and education. However, we need to examine our emphasis on education for the sake of a piece of paper, and to learn the real meaning and revolutionary challenge of knowledge.

19. Education: Still Invaluable!

In the past, degrees were very unusual in my family. I remember the day my uncle graduated. We had a huge party, and for many years my mother called him "the genius" and listened to his opinion. Today, in comparison five of my brothers and sisters have

degrees, and two are studying for their masters'. However, some people think that this increased access to education is devaluing degrees. In this essay, I will look at some of the arguments for and against the increased emphasis on degrees in our society.

People have several arguments against the need for degrees. They say that having so many graduates devalues a degree. People lose respect for the degree holder. It is also claimed that education has become a rat race. Graduates have to compete for jobs even after years of studying. Another point is that studying for such a long time leads to learners becoming inflexible. They know a lot about one narrow subject, but are unable to apply their skills. Employers prefer more flexible and adaptable workers.

However, I feel strongly that this move to having more qualifications is a positive development. In the past education was only for the rich and powerful. Now it is available to everyone, and this will have many advantages for the country and the individual. First of all, it is impossible to be overeducated. The more people are educated, the better the world will be, because people will be able to discuss and exchange ideas. A further point is that people with degrees have many more opportunities. They can take a wider variety of jobs and do what they enjoy doing, instead of being forced to take a job they dislike. Finally, a highly educated workforce is good for the economy of the country. It attracts foreign investment.

In conclusion, although there are undoubtedly some problems with increased levels of education, I feel strongly that the country can only progress if all its people are educated to the maximum of their ability.

339 words

20. It is often said that the subjects taught in schools are too academic in orientation and that it would be more useful for children to learn about practical matters such as home management, work and interpersonal skills. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

A criticism often heard these days is that the subjects taught in schools tend to be too academic, and contribute little to preparing a young person for the real-life tasks he or she will have to perform after graduation. They say that academic subjects are rooted in the past, and are not useful for solving modern problems. I disagree with this point of view for three reasons.

My first reason is that it is the duty of parents, not teachers, to prepare their children to deal with the practical affairs of life. The home, not the classroom, is the ideal place to learn about home management and interpersonal skills. As for work abilities and attitudes, they are best learned "on the job" and under the supervision of an experienced older worker.

My second reason is that academic subjects have withstood the test of time. They represent the accumulated wisdom of our ancestors down through the ages, and, far from being impractical, they equip us with the knowledge and confidence to make sound judgements about any problems which may crop up. In addition, academic subjects are good for training us in mental discipline, while practical subjects are weak in this regard.

My third reason is based on the saying “Man does not live by bread alone.” Schooldays devoted solely to instruction in down-to-earth practical matters would be dull indeed! Lessons in the best literature of the world, and the epoch-making scientific and geographical discoveries of the past enrich our lives and make us feel that we are part of the great family of mankind.

All in all, the teaching of academic subjects in schools is entirely appropriate. It is my firmly held view that practical subjects have no place in the classroom. On the contrary, the curriculum should be more academic!

21. It has been said, “Not every thing that is learned is contained in books.” Compare and contrast knowledge gained from experience with knowledge gained from books. In your opinion, which source is more important? Why?

“Experience is the best teacher” is an old cliché, but I agree with it. The most important, and sometimes the hardest, lessons we learn in life come from our participation in situations. You can’t learn everything from a book.

Of course, learning from books in a formal educational setting is also valuable. It’s in schools that we learn the information we need to function in our society. We learn how to speak and write and understand mathematical equations. This is all information that we need to live in our communities and earn a living.

Nevertheless, I think that the most important lessons can’t be taught; they have to be experienced. No one can teach us how to get along with others or how to have self-respect. As we grow from children into teenagers, no one can teach us how to deal with peer pressure. As we leave adolescence behind and enter adult life, no one can teach us how to fall in love and get married.

This shouldn’t stop us from looking for guidelines along the way. Teachers and parents are valuable sources of advice when we’re young. As we enter into new stages in our lives, the advice we receive from them is very helpful because they have already had similar experiences. But experiencing our own triumphs and disasters is really the only way to learn how to deal with life.

(252 words)

THE ENVIRONMENT & NATURAL SOURCE

22. Nowadays environmental problems are too big to be managed by individual persons or individual countries. In other words, it is an international problem. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

An essential problem of the 21st century is world pollution. Currently the environment is so much contaminated that urgent measures should be taken. The single individual cannot be blamed for the world pollution, however every person should take care of his or her habitat. In addition, it is vital that environmental issues should be treated internationally.

Lately, many presentations, conferences and international summits are held regarding waste treatment, recycling, soil and water contamination. For sure joint efforts and consolidation can only help in the mutual war towards the environmental disaster, which is going on. For instance, governments should offer support to companies and organizations, involved in manufacturing, industry or agriculture in order to find environment friendly approaches. These could be special law regulations, recycling programs, helping courses in order to implement ISO certificates and many more.

However, the influence of individuals over environment should not be ignored. If we do not confess that our planet is our home, we will never be able to take adequately care of it. We have to contribute every day to the preservation of nature and environment. For example, always remember to save energy by switching off lamps, computers and everything that we do not use. Our next obligation is to separate waste and throw bulk only in the designated areas. Driving vehicles can also be environment friendly. For example, we have to avoid accelerating the engines too rapidly or using the air condition in the country, where it will be better to save energy and simply open the windows.

To sum up, environmental problems should be handled by local and international authorities also. Every single person should take care of environment and moreover we have to bring up our children to be conscious citizens of a clean and preserved planet.

This is a very good essay, Band 7+ candidate. The structure of essay and sentences is correct as well as the spelling and punctuation. Good job!

**23. Nowadays we are producing more and more rubbish.
Why do you think this is happening?
What can governments do to help reduce the amount of rubbish produced?**

I think it is true that in almost every country today each household and family produces a large amount of waste every week. Most of this rubbish comes from the packaging from the things we buy, such as processed food. But even if we buy fresh food without packaging, we still produce rubbish from the plastic bags used everywhere to carry shopping home.

The reason why we have so much packaging is that we consume so much more on a

daily basis than families did in the past. Convenience is also very important in modern life, so we buy packaging or canned food that can be transported from long distances and stored until we need it, first in the supermarket, and then at home.

However, I think the amount of waste produced is also a result of our tendency to use something once and throw it away. We forget that even the cheapest plastic bag has used up valuable resources and energy to produce. We also forget that it is a source of pollution and difficult to dispose of.

I think, therefore, that governments need to raise this awareness in the general public. Children can be educated about environmental issues at school, but adults need to take action. Governments can encourage such action by putting taxes on packaging, such as plastic bags, by providing recycling services and by telling households and shops that do not attempt to recycle their waste.

With the political will, such measures could really reduce the amount of rubbish we produce. Certainly nobody wants to see our resources used up and our planet poisoned by waste.

(270 words)

24. Scientists and the news media are presenting ever more evidence of climate change. Governments cannot be expected to solve this problem. It is the responsibility of individuals to change their lifestyle to prevent further damage. What are your views?

Recently scientists worried about climate change have urged governments to introduce measures to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that are seen as its main cause. Simultaneously, politicians and environmentalists have urged individuals to make changes to their lifestyle. I shall argue that governments and individuals should take joint responsibility for this problem.

Firstly, industry accounts for a large proportion of the greenhouse gas emissions, and this can only be controlled by government action. Measures could be taken to discourage pollution, such as limiting or taxing the use of fossil fuels. Alternatively, subsidies could be offered to industries to clean up their production processes. If these ideas were adopted, I believe that businesses would regard pollution as a financial issue.

Secondly, only discussion between governments can ensure that solutions are successful. The Kyoto agreement, for example, tried to reach global agreement on how to address the problem. Without such co-operating, it seems to me that efforts to reduce fuel consumption are unlikely to be effective.

However, national and international policies will only succeed if individuals also change their lifestyle. For example, people could think more carefully about how they use energy in their homes. By using less electricity, installing energy-efficient light bulbs and electrical appliances, or investing in solar panels, individuals can make a real difference.

In addition, I think individual attitudes to transport need to change. Instead of making short

tips by car, people could choose to walk, cycle, or take a bus. Since cars are a major source of the problem, changing our behaviour in this area would have a major impact.

In conclusion, I would maintain that only a combination of international agreement, national policies, and changes in individual behaviour will succeed in preventing further damage to the environment.

(291 words)

25. Many parts of the world are losing important natural resources, such as forests, animals, or clean water.

Choose one resource that is disappearing and explain why it needs to be saved. Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.

As human's population is dramatically rising every year, people's requirements are increasing too. We need more food, more fresh water, more places to live. As a result of this many parts of the world are losing essential and sometimes irreplaceable resources, such as forest, animals, or fresh water. In this essay I will focus on the threat of disappearing many wild animals.

The reason why I think that animals should be preserved is that all living creatures on this planet are connected with each other. So, the disappearance of only one species can cause dramatic changes in the planet and even death of many other living creatures. For example, the disappearance of bats will cause the huge increasing of insect population and this will reflect on all animals and plants. Another example is that if the population of bats increases, the population of insects will decrease significantly, and this will cause the disappearance of many plants because insects are the main pollinators. So, I think it is very important to preserve all species on our planet and live in harmony with our environment.

Another important reason why I think that animals should be saved is that I, personally, do not want my child to learn about different animals from books and not be able to see them alive. I think it is shameful for humankind to explain our children that we are the reason why those animals disappeared.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the issue about losing important natural resources is topical and open for debate nowadays. I believe that together people can make a difference. From my point of view, the first problem we should find a solution for is human's overpopulation. As I mentioned above people's demands are growing and this means we consume more and more natural resources. The second question, which is on the list of most important issues, is pollution including the air pollution, water pollution, etc.

(325 words)

26. The rising levels of congestion and air pollution found in most of the world's cities can be attributed directly to the rapidly increasing number of private cars in use. In order to reverse this decline in the quality of life in cities, attempts must be made to encourage people to use their cars less and public transport more. Discuss possible ways to encourage the use of public transport.

Anyone who lives in a city is aware of the increasing number of cars on the road and the kinds of problems this creates: traffic jams, air pollution and longer commuting periods. As economies grow and access to cars spreads to increasing numbers of people, this trend is likely to worsen. The solution, it would seem, is for government to encourage the use of public transport in urban areas, thus decreasing dependence on the car.

One way to stimulate public transport use is to make private car use more expensive and inconvenient. The introduction of tolls along urban motorways has been successfully employed in many cities. Other such measures are high-priced permits for parking in urban areas and the restriction of parking to a limited number of cars. Faced with high costs or no place to park, commuters would perhaps be more willing to abandon their cars in favour of buses or trains.

There are also less punishing ways of spurring public transport use. The construction of free car parks at suburban train stations has proven successful in quite a number of countries. This allows commuters to drive part of the way, but take public transport into the central, most congested, urban areas.

Indeed, making public transport more comfortable and convenient should work to attract more commuters and decrease traffic congestion. Public transport that is convenient and comfortable retains its passengers, much like any business that satisfies its customers. The more commuters committed to taking public transport, the less congestion on city streets.

27. The earth is being filled with waste material such as plastic bags and other rubbish. Is this really happening? What are some solutions to this problem?

Over the past few decades, the increasing amount of industrial wastes and household garbage has become a major problem in many countries. People have questioned what caused this problem and what can be done to improve the situation. In my opinion, two of the most critical causes of this waste material problem are the increased consumption and a shortage of space for landfill.

To begin with, modern lifestyle has contributed greatly to the increasing amount of waste and garbage we produce everyday. In other words, we have turned into a materialistic and mass-consumption society where we use more and throw away more than ever before. Moreover, countries are running out of space to store garbage and waste material. In fact, securing land for waste disposal raises controversies in many countries.

To solve this intractable problem, every citizen needs to participate in producing less garbage. For example, we can bring our own personal shopping bags instead of using plastic bags provided by stores and shops. Besides, the government can enforce stricter laws on companies to use biodegradable packaging or use recycled material. Indeed, this alone can eliminate much of the waste which is sent to landfills. Companies can also contribute by developing new raw material which is recyclable and will ultimately lead to

less garbage. One good example of this is that tire companies develop new tires for cars which are not made of rubber but of new biodegradable material.

As discussed above, individuals, business and the government can share the responsibility to reduce the amount of waste material and to save the earth. I hope that in the future our offspring will be better off with the well-preserved environment.

(282 words)

SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

28. With all the troubles in the world today, money spent on space exploration is a complete waste. The money could be better spent on other things.

Nations after nations, everyday, every year, celebrate their achievements in space exploration. However, it is now time to question how meaningful these blasts are. This essay aims to explain why it is questionable.

First, until all urgent and important matters in this globe have been solved, money bumped on space exploration is of no meaning. It is not a common sense at all to invest million dollars researching and producing foods for astronauts (for space exploration purpose), while everyday thousands of people are starving. Furthermore, the discovery of outer space only serves a minor group of people if the majority are even not well-educated. Those in rural areas or third-world nations do not even know how to prevent common threatening diseases like AIDS and lung cancer.

Then, some may argue that the purpose of space exploration are to discover new lands, new energy resources or to deter potential threat to globe. Nevertheless, is it effective to do so while other alternatives are available? Lands on earth are not yet effectively used. New energy resources (e.g. solar and nuclear energy) have not yet been widely-used. Threats of plagues have not yet been deterred. All these 'not-yets' need money. That is why costly space discovery programs are a waste of money.

In the nutshell, people should only invest in space exploration providing that (1) early-mentioned urgent and important matters have been solved. Also, purposes of space exploration campaign should be studied carefully and other alternatives should be considered before money is wasted.

This is a very good essay, well done.

29. Some say that the internet is making the world smaller by bringing people together. To what extent do you agree that the internet is making it easier for people to communicate with one another.

A global village, that is certainly what the world feels like nowadays. With the help of the world wide web, you can reach out and get to know people you might never meet in person. Articles can be coauthored, business deals can be finalized, degrees can be earned and at times even medical advice can be given?and all of this is just a click away.

Electronic mail, instant messages, web cameras and microphones; all these gadgets and programs make the presence of the other the person more real. Who knows; with the help of visual reality you might even get a 3-D image of the speaker! I believe that the internet is one the best inventions of the last century, you can hardly get to miss anyone and nobody is really out of reach. You will get to keep the channels patent with your friends, and will be able to do your work from your bedroom in your pajamas!

However, the internet can also be a major source of harassment. Spammers and hackers can invade your privacy and get personal/confidential information, which otherwise they will never get access to. You are never out of anybody's reach, unless you make a conscious decision of not checking your email, there can be always more work waiting for you in your inbox and you might never have a moment for yourself. Worse, if you were a workaholic, you might never experience that stress-free vacation ever again in your life? simply, because you have your mobile workplace with you.

As a romantic, I will always look forward to getting an occasional letter in the snail mail. A personal letter, where I can sense the mood of the writer by the slants in his/her handwriting and get to know him/her better. But as a type A personality person, the internet gives me all what I dream of in communication? speed, reliability, and convenience of time and place. I can certainly tolerate its shortcomings any day, as long as it keeps me close to my loved ones.

This is a great essay, at least band 7 and maybe even 8. It is longer than required (340 words instead of 250) which means that it took you more time to write and less time to check your work.

30. Internet when used as a source of information, has more drawbacks than advantages. To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Some people believe that internet access creates problems. There are several possible reasons why it can happen.

First, some data may be unverifiable. For example, everytime they search for a data, there would be lots of choices that would appear on the screen. They would not be sure if the data they are reading has accurate information. Some sources have even outdated informations. Second, some sites may be unreliable. For instance, people sign up on one site that sells goods using online purchases. The goods would be paid for by credit card but the purchaser would not receive anything. And finally, not everything is available through the net. When my friend had tried to research for some pictures of 18th century paintings, he did not find any results. Then he was told by his teacher that it would only be available in the library.

Others believe that internet is very useful and these are the justifications. First, it is hard to get data, that is available in the net by other means. For example, if directory information could not give me the accurate address and contact number of the place I want to visit, I normally check that information from the Internet. In just one click, I would get all the details of that certain company. Second, research becomes more comprehensive. For instance, I do not have to buy lots of reading materials to complete my research. Most of the needed information can be found if I have Internet access. And finally, data is easily compared and contrasted. I remember, my cousin researched the study about overweight children a decade ago and at present. He was able to finish his research in just one day, as compared to week if he would not use the Internet.

In conclusion, let me reiterate that the Internet plays a big role in our life, because it makes data retrieval and comparison easier.

It's a good essay, the arguments are clear, the language and the grammar are also good. Structure needs to be improved little bit - make paragraphs smaller, re-divide so there would be 5 paragraphs instead of 4. In case it is argument essay ? give your opinion in the conclusion only. In case of opinion essay ? give your opinion in the introduction

31. Some people say that the Internet is making the world smaller by bringing people together. To what extent do you agree that the internet is making it easier for people to communicate with one another?

In today world _ due to the advancement of technology new inventions are coming into existence. It is a certainty that 'necessity is a mother of invention'. _ Internet is just like a wonder box, which contains every type of information. Besides it has also proved as a very important tool to connect people with each other.

In today's modernized era nobody has sufficient time to write letters to their loved ones. Moreover it also takes longer to send or receive any information. But through an internet it is an easiest way to send messages to our loved ones. Either it can be in the form of an e-mail or by text messages from internet to cell phones. We can send and receive messages straight way.

In other hand today's youth generation mostly prefer to do chatting on () internet. Through this chatting we can write messages and straight way can get their reply. Moreover voice chatting is going to be very popular day-by-day.

As it is a reality that advantages and disadvantages are like both sides of a coin, which usually runs parallel. So like other things internet also have some downsides, like people are facing some health problems for example, poor eye-sight, back ache, migraine. Today's teenagers usually prefer to spend their time on internet rather than to participating in other physical activities, so that's why they are going to be weaker in their physical health.

To conclude, I would like to say that internet is one of the most modernized and most successful tools, not only for communication, even to get most relevant information regarding every field in a very short period of time.

This is a great essay, well done! Remember 'the Internet' is a proper noun, currently, there is only one. Pay attention to your punctuation - many commas are missing after linking words. Otherwise, the essay is well argued and set out.

32. We have been living in the nuclear age now for over half a century. Since the first atomic bombs were developed, nuclear technology has provided governments with the ability to totally destroy the planet. Yet the technology has been put to positive use as an energy source and in certain areas of medicine. To what extent is nuclear technology a danger to life on Earth? What are the benefits and risks associated with its use?

These days, many people are afraid of nuclear technology because of the dangers associated with its use. In my opinion, although it is true that nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat to life, the use of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes also carries some serious risks.

Nuclear power stations provide an important source of cheap power for many industrialised nations and some developing countries. However, there is always the danger of radiation leaking from these plants. Even though safety precautions are taken, there have been numerous disasters such as the explosion of a nuclear plant in Russia not long ago.

Nuclear technology is even used to help cure some diseases such as cancer. Radiation can be applied to the body to burn away cancerous cells. This is, however, a dangerous procedure, and the application of radiation is almost always painful and not always successful.

The most worrying aspect of nuclear technology, though, is its use for military purposes. Enough atomic bombs have already been built to completely destroy the planet, and the real danger is that one day some country will start a war with these weapons. Too many countries now have the technology required to make such bombs, and there is currently much debate about how to control the situation.

In conclusion, nuclear technology certainly has positive uses, but is, nonetheless, dangerous. However, it would have been better if it had never been used to create nuclear weapons. If life on Earth is to continue.

33. 'Telecommuting' refers to workers doing their jobs from home for part of each week and communicating with their office using computer technology.

Telecommuting is growing in many countries and is expected to be common for most office workers in the coming decades.

How do you think society will be affected by the growth of telecommuting?

The spread of telecommuting is sure to have far-reaching effects on society. By itself, telecommuting refers to office workers spending much of their time working from home and using electronic technologies to communicate with their employers. The broader implications of telecommuting, however, may involve changes to corporate structure, workers' lifestyles and even urban planning.

The most obvious changes may be apparent in the 'normal' offices of companies, governments and other organisations. If even half the working week is spent telecommuting from home, then we would initially expect many empty desks in the office. As offices grow smaller, workers coming in for the day would be expected to share desks with their absent colleagues. This, in turn, may affect the social atmosphere of an organisation, however, as less social contact with one's colleagues could harm morale and loyalty.

For the individual office worker, telecommuting would mean spending more time at home. For a parent with young children, this may be a blessing. Moreover, many telecommuters would be able to work the hours they wished: having a nap in the afternoon, for example, but working some hours in the evening. One substantial benefit for all telecommuting workers is that there will be no need to travel to work, allowing more free time.

The structure of urban life is also likely to be affected by telecommuting. We would expect to see fewer cars on the road during peak hours and, eventually, a smaller concentration of offices in cities' central business districts. In short, people will have less reason to travel to city centres from outlying areas. As more people work and live in the same location, shops and cultural events will likely relocate themselves out of the city centre.

In sum, telecommuting will serve not only to change the way we work but also the way we live.

34. Telecommuting: will it change the world?

Telecommuting will have major effects in the worlds of work and family life. However, its biggest effect will be in the area of individual freedom, responsibility, and time management.

Work and workplaces will alter dramatically. Offices may become smaller, as fewer desks are needed. There will be greater need for high-bandwidth connections to link the office and the home, and even homes to other homes, as other employees and supervisors also begin working at home. Hours spent commuting, traffic jams, and fights for parking should diminish, as workers make fewer journeys or work staggered hours.

Family life will also change. Workers, both husbands and wives, can arrange their work around family commitments such as taking children to school, cooking, leisure activities, etc. However, households will also have to set aside areas for work - particularly if both spouses are telecommuting.

However, although the ideas of more time at home and less time traveling are attractive, there are some drawbacks to telecommuting. People may feel unable to escape their work, and may even work longer or more unsocial hours. The quality of work may suffer because of the reduced face-to-face interaction with other employees. There may be delays if other workers are not immediately available. Telecommuters may feel isolated or unmotivated, or insecure about decisions. A major change will be in the way people think about work as a place or an institution. Instead, they will focus on the task or product. Workers may feel less loyal to a company and more inclined to change jobs or work part-time or on contract.

In conclusion, the effects are difficult to predict because they depend on the extent to which telecommuting becomes popular. However, telecommuting could be the start of a major societal shift, possibly as big as the Industrial Revolution which created our present ideas of work.

(305 words)

35. With the increasing popularity of computers and calculators, student literacy is decreasing dramatically. What are the positive and negative effects the progress of science and technology has brought about?

It has been widely noted that, with the growing use of computers and calculators both in the classroom and in the home, the level of literacy and mathematical ability of students is dropping. This raises serious doubts about the value of the progress of science and technology. Here I will discuss the pros and cons of this question.

First of all, advances in science and technology have certainly brought about many benefits for mankind. They have made our lives more comfortable and healthier. In addition, they have eased the burden of work for most people and provided them with more leisure opportunities, while at the same time increasing productivity dramatically.

Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that technology has some negative side-effects. As mentioned above, with computers which check spelling, grammar and calculation for them, students have little incentive to learn how to do these things for themselves. Also, the availability of TV programs and videos encourages an unhealthy, sedentary lifestyle.

Another aspect of this issue is that technology may be good or bad, depending on how we use it. For instance, dynamite may be used to make road construction easier, or it may be used to kill people. Again, nuclear reactors can supply huge amounts of cheap electricity, but if they are carelessly handled they can cause devastating pollution.

We can conclude that the progress of science and technology has both positive and negative effects. What we must do is to make sure that the positive ones are encouraged and the negative ones are eliminated as far as possible. Among other things, this means that students are warned not to let computers and calculators do all their work for them.

THE MEDIA

36. Compare the advantages and disadvantages of three of the following as media for communicating information. State which you consider to be the most effective.

- Comics , books , radio , television , film , theatre

In our daily life, we always communicate information through the media, such as television, radio, film, These media have different advantages and disadvantages for us. Now, I am going to compare the advantages and disadvantages of books, television and film.

Books bring us different knowledge. It bases on what Book we read. A famous Chinese traditional verse which described books is a treasure. We can find a golden house in there. Moreover, when we want to read it, we can find it easily, such as bookstore, library. We can also learn a lot of words from books. And it can improve our reading and writing skills.

However, books always are not attractive for children or youngster. It is because books are quite boring. A lot of words and less pictures inside the books, compare to television, television has pictures and sound, we don't have to read a lot of words in television. But some artist in television programme or film, bring a bad image to us. Then some children or youngers will imitate their behaviour. Some film also bring a wrong message to us, For example, they are always smoking in films. It seems that smoking is good and smart. It caused many youngers imitate them smoking.

In conclusion, bookds, television and film have many advantages and disadvantages. I cannot write all in here. And we have choose the media carefully.

(231 words)

**37. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Television has destroyed communication among friends and family.
Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.**

The invention of television is undoubtedly one of humankind's greatest inventions. It is a way of communication among people of one country and different countries and nations. People watch TV to find out about the latest news, weather, sports, etc. It is a great way to learn new and extend one's range of interests. Scientists say that children spend the same amount of hours in front of TV as they do in school. I think that this can be said about many grown people too. Also, television is a great means of eliminating stress and tension. One can relax and leave one's troubles behind lying on one's favorite sofa and watching a comedy. However, some people believe that television has destroyed communication among friends and family.

Personally, I do not agree with this statement. A couple centuries ago people spent their time gambling, reading, gossiping or playing chess. I do not think that television is a

cause of destroyed communication among family members and friends. First of all, if members of a family have common interests and they want to make each other happy they will always find many ways to spend their time together and be close. Otherwise, if people avoid each other and they do not have anything to share with each other they will find television a great way to escape from this miserable existence. I believe that many people chose family and their friends over some soap operas or a movie.

Second of all, I think that television can be a great resource of subjects to discuss. Many people watch different educational programs to find out more about their environment, nature, wild life animals, economic situations, etc. So, when they gather with their friends they discuss important issues and argue with each other in looking for the truth.

My husband and I often watch the news channel to keep abreast of the latest news. After that we always discuss some issues we concerned about. Also, we like to watch a TV show "the funniest animals". We like this program because it makes us laugh. I can not imagine how these programs can prevent our communication and be harmful to our relations.

To summarize, I would like to add that if people want to communicate with each other they will find a way to do it. Otherwise, if television were not existent, people would find other escapes and reasons not to be with each other such as drugs, gambling, etc.

(413 words)

38. News editors decide what to broadcast on television and what to print in newspapers.

What factors do you think influence these decisions?

Do we become used to bad news?

Would it be better if more good news was reported?

It has often been said that. Good news is bad news. because it does not sell newspapers. A radio station that once decided to present only good news soon found that it had gone out of business for lack of listeners. Bad news on the other hand is so common that in order to cope with it, we often simply ignore it. We have become immune to bad news and the newspapers and radio stations are aware of this.

While newspapers and TV stations may aim to report world events accurately, be they natural or human disasters, political events or the horrors of war, it is also true that their main objective is to sell newspapers and attract listeners and viewers to their stations. For this reason TV and radio stations attempt to reflect the flavour of their station by providing news broadcasts tailor-made to suit their listeners. preferences. Programmes specialising in pop music or TV soap operas focus more on local news, home issues and up-to-date traffic reports. The more serious stations and newspapers like to provide .so called. objective news reports with editorial comment aimed at analysing the situation.

If it is true, then, that newspapers and TV stations are tailoring their news to their readers. and viewers. requirements, how can they possibly be reporting real world events in an honest and objective light? Many radio and TV stations do, in fact, report items of good news but they no longer call this news. They refer to these as human interest stories and

package them in programmes specialising, for instance, in consumer affairs or local issues. Good news now comes to us in the form of documentaries the fight against children.s cancer or AIDS, or the latest developments in the fight to save the planet from environmental pollution.

Sample 2:

News editors decide what to broadcast on television and what to print in newspapers. There are two factors that influence their decisions. The first is the kind of customers they tend on. Because each kind of readers and watchers has its own features. For example, if your customers are almost teenagers, you have to concentrate on something attracting them such as stories, photographs about singer stars, film stars, funny tales, and young fashion. It will be very silly if you try to provide teenagers with economic, politic news. On the contrary, business men and politicians may never read news about James Blunt or Keira Knightley. Therefore, what influence news editors' decisions the most is the taste of their customers.

The second is the hot, the attraction of news. Who will reads or watchs your news if it was one year, one month ago even last week? The answer is nobody absolutely. In the energetic and competitive world nowadays, people always ask for really new news. So that to satisfy customers, there is a pressure on all editors to find continually what has already happened not only yesterday but even an hour ago. Or else, they will lose their customers. None of editors wants that bad future.

On television or in newspaper, we seem to become used to bad news. It is a little of difficult for us to meet a piece of good news. We can't deny that bad things occur on the earth day by day. However, news editors try to gain more and more customer, which means more and more money, by bad news. Because bad news makes us curious. We want to know why it is bad, what it is about, whether it influences us or not. As a result, we will buy newspapers or watch television to find out. And the happiest people are, of course, news editors.

I think it would be better if more good news was reported. Bad news makes us worry and sad. Whereas good news makes us happy. How much bad news is, there should be the same amount of good news. So, we can give something bad a lot of thought while still be joyful with good news. Any inequalities between good news and bad news should be avoided. That is the best solution.

Now, we can't live without news. Thereby, the role of news editors is very important. We should support them. And what they have to do is try their best to provide us useful news, both good and bad.

***Some of your sentences are too short - they would look better joined together.
Overall, a very good essay ? to me it looks like Band 7 candidate.***

39. Many people believe that television programs are of no value for children. Do you agree? Why or why not? Provide reasons and examples to support your response.

Televisual media has become a pervasive force in the lives of families around the world today. Yet, a central question remains regarding whether watching television is harmful or beneficial for children. An analysis of this question reveals that television programs present three major concerns in the case of children, including depictions of violence, the use of profane language, and the representation of poor moral role models.

Television programs that portray violence are a paramount concern for parents nowadays. Recent research has shown that children may commit acts of violence because they wish to emulate the behavior that they see on television. This is especially true when violent acts are committed by well-known action “heroes.” In addition, television programs show cartoon figures, as well as actors, committing violent acts. Using comic situations to depict violent themes causes further problems with the way in which young people view violence.

Television programs that contain profane or disrespectful language also worry parents with young children. Because censorship laws have relaxed over the past few decades, it has become very common for television programs of each and every kind to show characters expressing impolite, rude, and insulting utterances to one another. Bearing resemblance to the case of portrayals of violence, children unfortunately often try to imitate these actions they watch on their television screens.

Finally, some parents are upset about the moral behavior depicted on television. As they struggle to teach their children moral and ethical values, parents might despair about the lack of morals and ethics represented in some of the so-called role models on television. For instance, certain characters not only have no remorse for their immoral actions, but also frequently go unpunished by larger society.

Because of these factors, many parents believe that television programs send their youth the wrong kinds of messages. The emulation of this poor behavior by their children is something they wish to avoid at all costs, and they have accordingly decided to ban television in their households for these reasons.

40. Television has had a significant influence on the culture of many societies. To what extent would you say that television has positively or negatively affected the cultural development of your society?

It has been around forty years since television was first introduced into Australian households and people today still have mixed views on whether it has a positive or a negative influence on the society.

Many people believe that television damages culture. It promotes the stronger cultures of countries such as Britain and North America and weakens the cultures of less wealthy countries. This is because the stronger, wealthier countries are able to assert their own culture by producing more programs that are shown widely around the world. These programs then influence people, particularly young people, in the countries where they are shown.

Also, because television networks need to attract large audiences to secure their financial survival, they must produce programs which are interesting to a broad range of people. In Australia this range is very broad because we are a multicultural society and people of all ages like to watch television. To interest all these different people, most television programs are short in length, full of action and excitement, do not require much intelligence or knowledge to understand, and follow universal themes common to all cultures, such as love and crime. Television programs which concentrate on or develop themes pertinent to one particular culture are not so successful because they interest a smaller audience.

Nevertheless we much acknowledge that television does have some positive effects on the cultures within a society as well. People who do not live within their own culture can, in a limited way, access it through the multicultural station on the television. For example, Aboriginal children who have grown up in white families, or migrants and international students living in Australia, can watch programs from their own culture on the television.

In conclusion, I hold the view that television promotes and strengthens those cultures that are wealthy and influential while it weakens the cultures that are already in a weakened position.

41. The mass media, including television, radio and newspapers, have great influence in shaping people's ideas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

The mass media have a powerful influence in shaping our lives. We have come to depend on them for information and entertainment, and in doing so we let them affect important aspects of our lives.

The undeniable usefulness of the media in almost instantly providing information about events around the world is largely taken for granted. But in our dependence on the media we have allowed them to mould our notions and opinions of events, places and people. Though few of us probably think about it, our conceptions of, say, our elected officials spring from television images and newspaper stories. Most of us will never meet prime ministers or presidents, but anyone who is regularly exposed to the media will have an opinion of them. When it is time to cast our vote, we will make our decision based on how the media portray the candidates. We are similarly swayed by coverage of wars. The media, representing the values of their owners, societies and governments, tend to report wars with a bias; which is the 'good' side and which the 'bad' is determined for us by reporters, editors and commentators, and sure enough the public begins to form opinions that reflect the coverage they see, hear and read in the major media.

The media are also influential in the way they facilitate the spread of culture and lifestyle. The so-called 'global youth culture', in which one finds young people around the world displaying a common interest in music, clothing styles and films, is an example of the media's enormous sway in this regard. A popular figure such as Michael Jackson would never be so well known were it not for the media's extensive reach into every society on the globe.

Thus I would argue that the mass media's influence is certainly great. Indeed, with technological advancements such as the Internet bringing even more forms of electronic

media to our homes and workplaces, it is likely the media's influence will grow even stronger.

ADVERTISEMENT AND CUSTOMER

42. Advertising is all around us, it is an unavoidable part of everyone's life. Some people say that advertising is a positive part of our lives while others say it is negative. Discuss both views and give your own opinion. Give reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own knowledge or experience. You should write at least 250 words.

Many people wonder about advertisement. Some people think that it has negative impact in our life. However, others said it has been playing as positive effect in this world. This is not an easy essay to be answered, but I will look at this issue.

Why advertisement has been playing a negative effect in our life ? Of Course for several reasons: firstly, it motivates the psychological point in every body especially women. They will run to buy this advertised product especially if it's from cosmetic roof, just to show their beauty to men, which will leads to more offender and raped cases. Secondly, you can sit comfortably with your family and suddenly the telephone is ringing, nothing important, rather than one of the companies try to convince you to buy one of their products. It is a real intrusive example of advertisement. Lastly, sometimes you do not have the financial ability to buy something, but with these new methods of advertisement, you will run to buy it, which will affect your budget.

On the other hand, there are some good things. Such as, it compares the prices of the most of companies which benefit the consumer. Beside, it really opens our vision to see more products which we do not knowit unless TV and Radio show these things. In addition to, it cut down our daily routine to see new faces and know more language with daily update for their method of advertisement.

In conclusion, as we can see there are many aspects to this essay. I feel that there is no benefit at all from advertisement, it plays on minds of people buy more thing that they do not need it at all.

43. When people need to complain about a product or poor service, some prefer to complain in writing and others prefer to complain in person. Which way do you prefer? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

It is rather difficult for me to answer the question how I prefer to complain: in writing or in person because sometimes I just do not have a choice. For example, if I order a product using the Internet from another state or even country, I will more likely have the opportunity to speak to a representative of a company in person. So, in some cases I choose to speak in person and in others I prefer to complain in writing. However, I believe that every option has its advantages.

From the one side, complaining in writing brings many benefits. First of all, one does not have to spend his precious time driving, waiting for his turn and talking with a representative. He can just send mail or e-mail and get all explanation he needs. Second of all, I think it is the best way to avoid an unpleasant conversation. Personally, I do not

like to complain about anything especially, in person. Finally, sometimes it is impossible to have a face-to-face conversation because a company which provided a poor product or service is too far away.

From the other side, complaining in person has some benefits too. First, this type of complaining provides an immediate feedback. So, if I have some complains about company's products I will receive all information and explanation right away. However, sending a company a letter and getting a feedback can take more then a month. Second, face-to-face conversation is often more effective. People talk to each other, see each other facial gestures and body movements, which can tell a lot about a person. In addition to these practical benefits, in the case if one can not receive creditable explanation from one representative he always can require to talk to another person. For instance, my husband recently had some extra withdraws from his account by his bank and he was not aware of it. So, he went to the bank and explained to the bank's representative the situation and they together found the solution and that money was given back to my husband's account. I think, in this case face-to-face conversation is the best way to complain and get feedback fast.

In conclusion, I think that if I have to complain about a product or poor service I will do it in person. However, if face-to-face conversation is impossible I think I have nothing left but to send a letter or write an e-mail there.

(409 words)

44. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Advertising can tell you a lot about a country.

Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Every country has its own culture and traditions. There is no doubt that an advertising campaign conducted in Russia will not have the same affect here in the United States. Let us take for example advertisement of food and restaurants.

A huge amount of fast food stands suggest their services for breakfast, lunch, dinner and supper here in Houston. The competition is very strong. Every week you get in your mail-box an envelope with different types of discounts in exchange for visiting them or ordering pizza. Watching TV you are also from time to time invited to visit a restaurant in order to taste some delicious food. It is not because it is easy to make money cooking but because the demand for such service is high. First of all, people like to go out sometimes to have dinner with friends. Second of all, it is often impossible to drive home for lunch. It can be time consuming.

As for Russia, it is a great tradition to have dinner at home with the family and go to the restaurant for big holidays. Additionally fast food is not popular in Russia. So you will see advertisements of yogurts, coffee, dairy products and juice instead of restaurants and fast food stands.

In conclusion I would like to add that in order to succeed in advertising campaign especially on the international market company must know traditions, language and history of the country.

(239 words)

**45. Some people say that advertising encourages us to buy things we really do not need. Others say that advertisements tell us about new products that may improve our lives. Which viewpoint do you agree with?
Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.**

I think that everyone can divide all advertising products and services into useless ones and useful ones. It is like looking through an information desk when you pay attention to those messages that interest you. Take me for example.

I do not like jewelry. It does not mean I do not have it at all, I have a couple of inexpensive rings as gifts from my parents. I just think, people pay too much attention to this stuff. I believe it is the result of mass advertising. Every day when I am watching TV, listening to the radio or reading the paper I notice many ads about getting an expensive ring, chain, necklace or ear-rings. From my point of view these kinds of advertising contaminate people's minds. In this case you are encouraged to buy things you do not really need. They make you believe you need such products in order to succeed or be happy.

From the other side, I think that advertisements of the new detergents with up-to-date formulas to help you maintain your cloth in perfect conditions, the new cars with some extra futures that make your traveling more comfortable and sports goods that make your life healthier may help you to improve your life.

Recently my husband and I saw an ad on the Internet about a very interesting and inexpensive vocation to Japan for a week. Is not it awesome? We like traveling. So now we are planning to find out more about it and, may be, make reservations. I believe that without advertisements we would be unaware about plenty of oppotunities that may make your life happier, easier and less stressful.

My point is that every person has his own scale of values. So if he is vegetarian he will consider an ad about meat products useless for him.

(305 words)

**46. Some people say that advertising encourages us to buy things that we really do not need. Others say that advertisements tell us about new products that may improve our lives.
Which viewpoint do you agree with?**

The purpose of advertising is to tell the consumer about any new product or service or any new promotion on the existing product and service. We need it so we can make good decisions when we go shopping. Advertising tells us when new and improved products become available and lets us know which ones have the best price.

Through advertising we learn about new products. For example, many grocery stores now sell prepackaged lunches. These are very convenient for busy parents. They can give these lunches to their children to take to school. Busy parents don't have time to look at every item on the store shelf, so without advertising they might not know about such a convenient new product.

Even products we are familiar with may be improved, and advertising lets us know about this. Most people use cell phones, but new types of cell phone service become available all the time. There are different plans that give you more hours to talk on the phone, you can send text messages and photos, and next week probably some even newer type of service will be available. By watching advertisements on TV it is easy to find out about new improvements to all kinds of products.

Advertisements keep us informed about prices. Prices change all the time, but everyone can look at the ads in the newspaper and see what the latest prices are. Advertisements also inform us about sales. In fact, some people buy the newspaper only in order to check the prices and plan their weekly shopping.

Advertisements improve our lives by keeping us informed about the latest products developments and the best prices. Advertisements serve a useful purpose.

(281 words)

CHILDREN

47. In some countries children have very strict rules of behaviour, in other countries they are allowed to do almost anything they want. To what extent should children have to follow rules?

Freedom plays a mandatory role in everybody's life. We can see in today's modernized era nobody likes to get some restrictions upon them, whether it would be a child or an adult. Some people think that there should have some strict rules of behaviour for children, but I disagree with this statement.

Wherever it is a reality that sometimes more restrictions can cause more frustration in children, which leads to many other mental diseases as well. Moreover they can be, behave like a stubborn. Sometimes they feel themselves under pressure, which can be a main reason for their poor performance in their field. In some cases children would be crazier to do these things from where we'll try to keep them away.

In other words _ we have to look for other aspects as well, like if we usually ignore our children's bad habits, then they can't be good human beings in their future life. Moreover_ if we never draw attention upon the children's main activities then they may be acquiring bad company. They can know regarding the value of respect for their elders. They can know the importance of relationships. They can know regarding their cultural values as well.

In a nutshell, I would like to say that children should be teach regarding the value of their customs, rituals and respect towards their elders for their future life, but most of the extra restriction should be being avoided. It would be better to make them good human beings in their coming future.

A good essay, set out well. Some sentences are too short and could be combined together to create more complex structure. There are also some repetitions of the same words, that should be avoided. Overall, nicely done.

**48. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Parents are the best teachers. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.**

Parents shape their children from the beginning of their children's lives. They teach their children values. They share their interests with them. They develop close emotional ties with them. Parents can be very important teachers in their children's lives; however, they are not always the best teachers.

Parents may be too close to their children emotionally. For example, they may limit a child's freedom in the name of safety. A teacher may organize an educational trip to a big city, but a parent may think this trip is too dangerous. A school may want to take the children camping, but a parent may be afraid of the child getting hurt.

Another problem is that parents sometimes expect their children's interests to be similar to their own. If the parents love science, they may try to force their child to love science too. But what if the child prefers art? If the parents enjoy sports, they may expect their child to participate on different teams. But what if the child prefers to read?

Parents want to pass on their values to their children. However, things change. The children of today are growing up in a world different from their parents' world. Sometimes parents, especially older ones, can't keep up with rapid social or technological changes. A student who has friends of different races at school may find that his parents have narrower views. A student who loves computers may find that her parents don't understand or value the digital revolution.

Parents are important teachers in our lives, but they aren't always the best teachers. Fortunately, we have many teachers in our lives. Our parents teach us, our teachers teach us, and we learn from our peers. Books and newspapers also teach us. All of them are valuable.

Sample 2 :

Throughout my life, I have been lucky enough to have a very good relationship with my parents. They have supported me, given me necessary criticism, and taught me a great deal about how to live my life. Parents can be very important teachers in our lives; however, they are not always the best teachers.

Parents may be too close to their children emotionally. Sometimes they can only see their children through the eyes of a protector. For example, they may limit a child's freedom in the name of safety. A teacher might see a trip to a big city as a valuable new experience. However, it might seem too dangerous to a parent.

Another problem is that parents may expect their children's interests to be similar to their own. They can't seem to separate from their children in their mind. If they love science, they may try to force their child to love science too. But what if their child's true love is art, or writing, or car repair?

Parents are usually eager to pass on their value to their children. But should children always believe what their parents do? Maybe different generations need different ways of thinking. When children are young, they believe that their parents are always right. But when they get older, they realize there are other views. Sometimes parents, especially older ones, can't keep up with rapid social or technology changes. A student who has friends of all different races and backgrounds at school may find that her parents don't really understand or value the digital revolution. Sometimes kids have to find their own ways to what they believe in.

The most important thing to realize is that we all have many teachers in our lives. Our parents teach us, our teachers teach us, and our peers teach us. Books and newspapers and television also teach us. All of them are valuable.

(316 words)

49. The number of overweight children in developed countries is increasing. Some people think this is due to problems such as the growing number of fast food outlets. Others believe that parents are to blame for not looking after their children's health.

To what extent do you agree with these views?

There is plenty of evidence to suggest that children are overweight and the situation is getting worse, according to the medical experts. I feel there are a number of reasons for this.

Some people blame the fact that we are surrounded by shops selling unhealthy, fatty foods such as chips and fried chicken, at low prices. This has created a whole generation of adults who have never cooked a meal for themselves. If there were fewer of these restaurants, then children would not be tempted to buy take-away food.

There is another argument that blames the parents for allowing their children to become overweight. I tend to agree with this view, because good eating habits begin early in life, long before children start to visit fast food outlets. If children are given chips and chocolate rather than nourishing food, or are always allowed to choose what they eat, they will go for the sweet and salty foods every time, and this will carry on throughout their lives.

There is a third factor, however, which contributes to the situation. Children these days take very little exercise. They do not walk to school. When they get home, they sit in front of the television or their computers and play video games. Not only is this an unhealthy pastime, it also gives them time to eat more junk food. What they need is to go outside and play active games or sport.

The two views discussed play an equal role in contributing to the problem, but I think we have to encourage young people to be more active, as well as steering them away from fast food outlets and bad eating habits. We need to have a balanced approach.

Position: Writer refers to a number of reasons in the introduction, and to the need for a balanced view in the conclusion.

Main ideas: First sentence of the second paragraph; first and second sentences of the third paragraph; second sentence of the fourth paragraph.

Linkers: and, according to, some people, such as, if, then, there is another argument, because, or, there is a third factor, however, not only, also, the two views discussed, but, as well as

Reference words: the, this, who, themselves, these, this view, they, their, them

Topic vocabulary: medical experts, shops, unhealthy, fatty foods, chips, cooked, take-away food, chocolate, sweet and salty, exercise, walk, television, computers, video games, unhealthy pastime, junk food, active games, sport, fast food outlets

Sentence types: A wide range of complex structures and sentences is used.

Length: 286 words

50. In many countries today, the eating habits and lifestyle of children are different from those of previous generations. Some people say this has had a negative effect on their health.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

It has recently been suggested that the way children eat and live nowadays has led to a deterioration in their health. I entirely agree with this view, and believe that this alarming situation has come about for several reasons.

To begin with, there is the worrying increase in the amount of processed food that children are eating at home, with little or none of the fresh fruit and vegetables that earlier generations ate every day. Secondly, more and more young people are choosing to eat in fast-food restaurants, which may be harmless occasionally, but not every day. What they eat there is extremely high in fat, salt and sugar, all of which can be damaging to their health.

There is also a disturbing decline in the amount of exercise they get. Schools have become obsessed with exams, with the shocking result that some pupils now do no sports at all. To make matters worse, few even get any exercise on the way to and from school, as most of them go in their parents' cars rather than walk or cycle. Finally, children are spending far more time at home, playing computer games, watching TV or surfing the Internet. They no longer play outside with friends or take part in challenging outdoor activities.

To sum up, although none of these changes could, on its own, have caused widespread harm to children's health, there can be little doubt that all of them together have had a devastating effect. This, in my opinion, can only be reversed by encouraging children to return to more traditional ways of eating and living.

(267 words)

51. In many countries children are engaged in some kind of paid work. Some people regard this as completely wrong, while others consider it as valuable work experience, important for learning and taking responsibility. What is your opinion on this?

Nowadays, many children involved in different types of jobs to have some kind of financial assurance for themselves. However, whether this is good for their development and personality is a much debatable issue. I personally believe that paid work is harmful for children for several reasons.

It is said that children learn valuable experience in the work place. This may be true. However, I would argue that children are mainly employed for jobs that require manual work and are low paid. The recent statistic reveals the common tasks that children are assigned are washing dishes, cleaning floors or serving food in restaurants. Meanwhile, this kind of jobs actually do not provide children with necessary and useful skills so that they can apply in their future career.

This brings me to the second point. Defenders of child work argue that it is an effective method of learning. The point is children should be able to apply knowledge taught to

them in a real life working environment. Although this is undoubtedly true, it also means that children may neglect the classroom study and even fail the class. The worst thing is yet to come. They may become so occupied with the benefits ahead of them like small salary and leave school.

Finally, supporters said that it helps them to build responsibility in the family. They will understand how it is difficult to earn money and therefore have a compassionate view with their parents. This is true to a certain extent, but may have a totally adverse effect on children. As children can make money at an early age, they would feel that it is appropriate to spend on luxury things by their own money, which could be recovered later.

In conclusion, I think that parents should take measures to restrict their child to work, otherwise it would have a negative consequences on their futures.

This is a great essay, Band 7+ candidate. My only suggestion is to divide your arguments so that you have 2 paragraphs covering arguments ?against? and one covering arguments ?for? or vice versa. Don?t mix ?for? and ?against? in one paragraph.

**52. Children should never be educated at home by their parents. Do you agree or disagree?
Discuss the advantages and disadvantages for young people who decide to do this.**

Nobody can say with confidence that children should be taught at home or at any children's institutions. There are many different children and every one demand of education suitable only for him.

But for most of children the best way of learning the life is being in the children's institutions. Nobody would argue that contacts between children of the same age are very important for bringing your child up. Such a contact is very important for playing, entertaining and learning living with other people. The harmonious living with other people, to my mind, is the first task for any man. Lack of this harmony sets problems and troubles.

The children need space to run and make noise, to jump and cry. Do you or your neighbours allow these actions for your child? If you live in town, it is difficult to find a safe place to play. Kindergartens give such a possibility. They give space, a lot of toys and constructions for physical exercises. So, if you have bad living conditions, the kindergarten is the best way for you. But if you have a large family with many children and enough space, you may keep your child at home. You should be sure that the child feels, dressed and comfortable. His brothers and sisters give him necessary contacts. It's noticed long ago that children in big families are much more easy-tempered and calm. They are located in more harmonic world than others.

Sometimes differences in age put troubles in contacts between children in large families. Then it is better for child to be sent to the kindergarten (school). But if quarrels don't last for a long time, everything is all right. In general, quarrels develop ability to cooperate with people. They develop a personal initiative and force setting the balance. In such a way the child gets lessons of life. Addly, the quarrels often take place in kindergartens and schools and we shouldn't fear it.

Side by side with quarrels parents often are afraid of colds which happen in kindergartens more frequently. Parents prefer keeping the child at home. But for a healthy child odd cold (if illness occurs, it goes its normal course) can't make big harm to the child. And if the child is adaptable to the conditions of public places earlier it would be better for him in future.

In general, I am a follower of the theory of keeping children in adapted places such as good kindergartens. But keeping children in such a place can't replace family and home. Only together they make harmonic and beautiful union.

(431 words)

53. Some people think that a sense of competition in children should be encouraged. Others believe that children who are taught to co-operate rather than compete become more useful adults. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

Nowadays, purpose of education being changed in Korea. There are some People who think that competition in children should be made, also others believe that children who are taught to co-operate as well as become more usefwl adults. There are advantages and disadvantages for both of the arguments.

To begin with, what is good if a sense of competition m children is made? They could develop themselves more and more as they learn and study a lot to win from the competitbn. To prove this, in Korea, it is popular - even common now - to have a tutor who come to student's house to teach extra pieces of study with paying a lot of money. They learn faster than what they learn at school. Furthermore, during the vacations, students study abroad to learn English for a month instead of revise school work. If they have experiments such as study abroad, it is one of the greatest plus point to go to the famous well-known high-school. Moreover, there are four big school exam and two national examinations to test students' level of studies. Generally, only the highest 40% can go to the good qatrty highschools and colleges. Children learn as much as they can, to wim the competition to obtain good quality schools.

On the other hand, as they are busy to enter the schools and study individually with their own tutors, there are problems. They become selfish. They become careless and don't help others alot if it is about studies. There will be no co-operations for them. Then, why are there companies for many people to work in? Each of them are clever, however, there are weak parts and strong parts for each person. To co-operate is to improve this part. People talk and listen to what others thmking of and learn. That could also be a great opportunity to learn instead of learning alone with one teacher.

In conclusion, I strongly agree with that children should be taught to co-operate rather than compete. Nobody is perfect. People learn together, work together to develop each other. Therefore, I want parents and teachers to educate children concentrating on co-operation, not compete and ranking them.

(365 words)

**54. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Classmates are a more important influence than parents on a child's success in school.
Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.**

I can not completely agree with the statement that classmates are a more important influence than parents on a child's success in school. In this essay I will first focus on the reasons why I agree with this statement and then list a few points why from my opinion in some cases is not true.

From the one side, classmates have a significant influence on child's behavior and his or her success in school. First of all, children spend much time at school. Classmates have many things in common such as age, interests, homework and classes after all. So, they discuss their impressions about a new teacher, solve problems together, learn their homework, gain new knowledge and experience and even make their own discoveries. Sharing all these makes them closer. Some of them become friends and they spend after-school time together. In addition friends tend to copy each other's habits and manners. For instance, my little sister became friends with the girl who did not have good grades at school at that time. It does not mean she could not have better grades; she just had many friends who did not care about their grades. So, when they started to spend their time together and share their interests, girl's grades improved. They did their homework together, shared their dreams and exciting moments. From this point I must agree that classmates can change child's attitude towards school.

From the other side, parents have a great influence on children's success in school too. For example if parents show an interest in their child's progress and talk to him or her about the importance of learning I think their child will listen to them and do his or her best.

Personally, I believe that relationships between parents and a child play an essential role in child's success in school. If these relationships are close and wholehearted I am sure that parents should not be afraid of bad influence from the outside.

(328 words)

**55. It is better for children to grow up in the countryside than in a big city.
Do you agree or disagree?
Use specific reasons and examples to develop your essay.**

Some people believe that it is better for children to grow up in the countryside than in a big city. However, other people think that a big city gives more opportunities and it is good for the long run. Personally, for several reasons I think that it is better for children's health to grow up in the country.

First of all, it is very important for a child to grow up in a healthy environment. Children need fresh air, not polluted by the huge amount of cars and factories of the modern city. In the country they can spend more time exercising and walking with their friends. Scientists say that now children spend the same amount of time watching TV as they do at school. Probably, the possibility to join their friends for a play will change this

proportion. Another important aspect of this is that parents will have more time to spend with their children as a result of eliminating traffic jams and decreasing driving time as a whole.

From the other side, children have some advantages living in a big city. For example, they have more opportunities to choose from what they want to do. They can choose to attend ballet school, school of art, gymnastics, etc. For the long run, it is good for them. They will be better prepared for a live in a "real world" and they will have more chances to make a good career and succeed. Moreover, a big city usually has many entertaining centers with movie theatres and play stations. When I was a child I liked to go to the movie theatre with my parents to watch a premiere.

One more reason to choose a big city for a child is that a city provides better live conditions and services such as medical, dental, etc. My friend lived in the country for a while and one time he and his family had to drive a couple of hours to the nearest medical center when his child got a heavy cough.

To summarize, I agree with those people who want to raise their children in a city. The plenty of opportunities offered by a city helps children to find what they really like and be the best at it. Moreover, despite the air pollution, children get a better medical service that is good for their health.

(394 words)

56. Some people think that children should begin their formal education at a very early age and should spend most of their time on school studies. Others believe that young children should spend most of their time playing. Compare these two views. Which view do you agree with? Why?

People learn through their entire lives. Curiosity was always the basic characteristic of a human being. We always want to break limits and learn more. At this point some people think that children should begin their formal education at a very early age and spend most of their time on school studies. This will help them to succeed in the future. However, for several reasons, which I will explain bellow, I think that children should not study at a very early age.

Of cause, children who begin to study at a very early age have more chances to succeed in the future. They gain more knowledge and experience which are priceless and valuable. In addition, studying more now they will give them the opportunity to perfect their knowledge in the future and become better professionals.

However, I think that every child must have his or her childhood. Children should learn through playing and communication with their friends and parents. I think that such basic qualities as kindness, self-confidence and just a good sense of humor can not be gained from studying. Children should more time spend with their family, playing and learning with their parents. Imagine that a child instead of playing with his friends does his homework and feel exhausted and tired. Another important aspect of this is that children at their early ages need more exercise because at this age the development of their body is a very essential aspect. Children first of all must be healthy.

To sum up, I think that children should have their careless childhood with no responsibilities. Moreover, I am sure that playing helps them develop not only their bones and muscles but their ability to make decisions, analyze things, make conclusions, which is very good for their future.

(296 words)

**57. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Children should begin learning a foreign language as soon as they start school.
Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.**

Language is the best means of communication. In the modern globalization era it is not enough to be able to speak one language to communicate with the outside world. I strongly support the idea that children should begin learning a foreign language as soon as they start school. They faster become familiar with a strange language, improve their hearing ability to understand new words as time goes by and learn new words. In the following paragraphs I will list some reasons to support my position.

First of all, if one wants to see outcome soon, one must start sooner. So, the early children begin to learn new language the better will be the result. Scientists say that a child does not confuse two different languages but learns them more effectively.

Second of all, adults are often afraid to make mistakes when they are speaking in a new language. This fear is one of the biggest barriers for a person in his efforts to speak freely. Otherwise, children do not afraid of making grammatical mistakes because basically they just repeat words and sentences in the way they hear them. Also, children have a better chance to get rid of an accent. They faster get used to the right pronunciation and better feel the melody of a language.

To sum up, I think that it is very essential for children to begin learning a foreign language in their early ages. It brings many benefits such as great pronunciation. Also, it helps a child develop and gain more knowledge which is good for a long run.

(264 words)

**58. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Watching television is bad for children.
Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.**

Some parents believe that watching television is bad for their children. So, they try to restrict their children from watching TV. However, other parents think that there is nothing bad in watching TV. Personally, I think that watching TV brings children only benefits unless they spend in front of TV set less then a couple of hours daily. For the following reasons, which I will mention bellow, I believe that television plays an essential role in child's development.

First of all, television helps a child to extent his or her range of interests. Children can find out many new things and make many exiting discoveries for themselves. In addition to

these practical benefits television improves children's vocabulary, their memory and gives them the opportunity to gain more knowledge. I think it is very essential for a child. Of course, someone can say that there are plenty of different recourses of information such as books and teachers. But, I think, in our modern world children must learn faster and use all contemporary technology in order to succeed.

Second of all, watching cognitive programs helps children to learn more about wild life, our environment and about the importance of preserving our forest and wild animals that live there.

Scientists say that a child should not watch TV more then 40 minutes successively. For example, my mother always made us have a break after watching TV more then half an hour and let our eyes rest for several minutes before turning on the TV again. I think it is the best solution.

To sum up, I believe that television gives children and all people the opportunity to learn what can not be learn from books. Television and movies in particular allow people to feel the reality and see what they will most likely not be able to see in their lives. Personally, when I was a child I liked to watch cognitive programs about wild animals. Unfortunately, my family had only one TV, but these programs were the only ones we all wanted to watch. So, we gathered in our living room and watched them in complete silence and I always remember those moments with a smile on my face.

(367 words)

59. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Parents or other adult relatives should make important decisions for their (15 to 18 year-old) teenage children.

Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.

Parents are in most cases our first teachers and friends. From my everyday experience I have to agree with the statement that important decisions should be made by our parents or adult relatives. In the following paragraphs I will give my reasons to support this statement.

First of all, teenage children have the tendency to live in their own fantasies. They do not clearly understand the rules of a real life. When I was 18 years old I thought that the world was perfect and everything seemed to be simple. Teenagers are basically inexperienced; they aspire for independence and try to make their first steps towards freedom. I think that it is like starting to walk when a baby needs its parents for support. An independent life is a big and significant part in a person's life. So, my point is that it is very important to make this step right.

Second of all, I think that parents have right to interfere in their children's lives. They need to know what kind of friends their children have and how children spend their spare time. For example I had an eighteen years old friend who got really angry with his parents when they prohibited him to be friends with a young man. Somehow his parents found out that that young man was occasionally taking drugs. That man was dead in a year because of drug abuse. After that accident my friend thanked his parents for that interference.

Finally, I think teenage children should be more open-minded with their parents. It will help them to make the right choice and avoid many mistakes.

To sum up, I believe that young people should trust their parents because they wish their children only the best.

60. It is better for children to grow up in the countryside than in a big city.

Do you agree or disagree?

Use specific reasons and examples to develop your essay.

Some people believe that it is better for children to grow up in the countryside than in a big city. However, other people think that a big city gives more opportunities and it is good for the long run. Personally, for several reasons I think that it is better for children's health to grow up in the country.

First of all, it is very important for a child to grow up in a healthy environment. Children need fresh air, not polluted by the huge amount of cars and factories of the modern city. In the country they can spend more time exercising and walking with their friends. Scientists say that now children spend the same amount of time watching TV as they do at school. Probably, the possibility to join their friends for a play will change this proportion. Another important aspect of this is that parents will have more time to spend with their children as a result of eliminating traffic jams and decreasing driving time as a whole.

From the other side, children have some advantages living in a big city. For example, they have more opportunities to choose from what they want to do. They can choose to attend ballet school, school of art, gymnastics, etc. For the long run, it is good for them. They will be better prepared for a live in a "real world" and they will have more chances to make a good career and succeed. Moreover, a big city usually has many entertaining centers with movie theatres and play stations. When I was a child I liked to go to the movie theatre with my parents to watch a premiere.

One more reason to choose a big city for a child is that a city provides better live conditions and services such as medical, dental, etc. My friend lived in the country for a while and one time he and his family had to drive a couple of hours to the nearest medical center when his child got a heavy cough.

To summarize, I agree with those people who want to raise their children in a city. The plenty of opportunities offered by a city helps children to find what they really like and be the best at it. Moreover, despite the air pollution, children get a better medical service that is good for their health.

61. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

Children should be required to help with household tasks as soon as they are able to do so.

Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

The issue about whether children should help with household tasks as soon as they are able to do so is open for debate. Some people say that children should devote more time for playing with their friends, watching TV and studying. However, other people believe that children should help their parents with household tasks. Personally, for several reasons, which I will explain bellow, I adhere to the latter point of view.

First of all, I think that every child should have his or her own responsibilities. When I was a child my parents taught me how to make breakfast in the morning. So, I woke up, went to the kitchen and prepared a couple of toasts for breakfast. It was easy and I enjoyed doing it because I liked the way my parents thanked me and I felt that they were proud of me. Also, my mom always wanted me to know how to cook, clean and iron my cloth. Thanks to the learning, nowadays, when my maid can not come to my house I handle all household tasks myself.

Second of all, performing household tasks teaches children to value the job of people who did it. When I was a child I did not imagine that cleaning house could be so time and energy consuming. So, when I began to do some of the household tasks by myself I began to respect the job of others and tried to collect all my toys after my playing with them.

Finally, doing household tasks teaches children to arrange their time. In addition to those practical benefits, help from children allows parents to have more spare time for their personal lives and for the children. A family can have more time to spend with each other talking, watching movies or just enjoying the beautiful moments.

To sum up, I think that children should help their parents with household tasks. Doing household tasks helps them to grow into independent, self-confident, and attentive persons who respect their parents.

(334 words)

62.Children's lives these days are quite different from our generation's. Describe what are the biggest changes in younger generation and explain some factors of this phenomenon.

Over the past few decades, the world has significantly changed. Nowadays, many have begun to wonder what the reasons behind [=for] these changes are. Two major factors contributing to this phenomenon are advances in media and change family dynamics [=organization].

First, advances in media, such as the Internet and TV, have meant that children spend a large portion of their leisure time in front of a screen. Consequently, they are not getting proper amounts of exercise, which results in an increase in the number of children who are overweight and obese. In addition, fast food restaurants have become increasingly popular, which has also contributed to children's health problems

Moreover, another leading force of this trend is changes in the family unit. Compared with a half century ago, nuclear families have become way more common in modern society. People tend to have only one child, which has caused personality disorders such as depression, loneliness, and selfishness. This is mainly because parents with one child have tendency to put all their focus and money into their only son or daughter. Studies have indicated that over 65% of children who are brought up without siblings show self-centered behavior find it difficult cooperating with their peers.

In summary, there are many factors that have caused children to live very differently from the generation before them. There are high hopes that parents exercise(s) wisdom in treating their children. (270 words)

63. It is widely believed that children of different levels of intelligence should be taught together, while others think that more intelligent children should be taught separately.

Discuss and present your own opinion.

In past educational institutions, children have been taught together based on age regardless of intellectual ability displayed at school. Alternatively, a large proportion of the population believes there should be a strong move towards the separation of children of different intellectual capabilities in current educational institutions. From my own educational perspective, I honestly believe that younger students possessing higher intelligence levels than their peers ought to be separated into alternative levels based on their gift, for a number of reasons.

Admittedly, although young learners have the chance to learn a lot from associating with classmates their own age, it is widely believed that such a process isn't considered to be vital for a healthy educational upbringing. The argument for intellectual separation holds some strong advantages. Firstly, by allocating students to classes based on levels of intelligence, high achievers have the opportunity to excel in a way that they couldn't in a normal class. Owing to the fact that they can be placed into an unrestricted educational environment, students can excel with intellectual freedom.

Secondly, there is a strong argument in regards to inhibiting a child's intellectual growth by restricting them from moving above their peers if their mental capability permits. Why should we limit the intelligence of our future generation? For instance, many of today's highly successful artists and entrepreneurs in the world have come from an unrestricted educational background and have been allowed to explore their mind and careers to the fullest extent.

In conclusion, although I believe an educational environment for young learners should promote equal opportunity, I honestly think that creating a more liberal environment which enhances the learning capabilities of intellectually-gifted children will not only benefit individual's careers but future society as a whole.

(288 words)

64. Some people believe that childrens leisure activities must be educational, otherwise they are a complete waste of time.

Do you agree or disagree?

Today, education has become a priority for many parents seeking to secure a good future for their children in this rapidly changing world. They believe that if their children apply themselves and work hard at school, then they will increase their opportunities for going to higher education and eventually getting a good job. Of course they are right, and as access to the best education and best jobs is becoming more competitive, then it is true that children have to make the best of their study time when they are young.

However, the parents who do not allow their children sufficient free time for leisure activities outside school hours, are misguided. Such activities are far from being a waste of time for the children simply because they are not academic. It is important to remember that children need to develop skills other than intellectual ones, and the best way to do this is through activities such as sports, games and playing with other kids. If they cannot

play make-believe games, how can they develop their imagination? How can they learn physical co-ordination or learn important social lessons about winning and losing if they do not practise any sports? Many children form strong, personal relationships with the friends they play with, and without the opportunity to do this, they could grow up emotionally immature or unformed.

Finally, I think it is also important to remember that children need to relax as well as work. If everything they do must have some educational or academic relevance, then they will soon get tired of studying altogether, which is the last thing parents would want.

65. Physical Punishment for Children ?

There have been big changes in the attitudes of most parents over the last few years. Very few parents would agree with using force regularly as a way of dealing with discipline problems in their children. Physical punishment is banned in schools in most countries, and in many countries, there are moves to ban all corporal punishment of children even in the home. However, many parents still believe that they have a right to use some physical punishment to deal with certain misbehaviors at certain ages. This essay will ask if some physical punishment is acceptable today, and will ask how parents can know what the limits are.

It is easy to find reasons to allow some physical punishment. One issue is that many parents find it very difficult to abandon physical punishment completely. Parents argue that this was the way they were brought up themselves and that it didn't do any harm to them. They believe that for the child's sake that they have the right to discipline the child in any way they see fit, including using corporal punishment. A second point is that corporal punishment can be quick and effective: there is not much point reasoning with a screaming child in the supermarket. Finally, most parents are reasonable and fair, and very very few would ever consider hurting their children by using unnecessary physical force.

There are several reasons however why we should stop using physical punishment even in the home. One point is that most parents are not trained to deal with misbehaving children. They do not have enough resources or choices to handle the situation. As a result, they immediately react by smacking or hitting the child, even if there are other solutions to the problem. Another point is that unless people are challenged or forced to change their beliefs they may keep following negative habits. An example is seatbelt use - now most people wear seat belts without thinking, whereas years ago the idea of using safety belts was strange to most people. In the same way, banning physical punishment in the home will allow people to change their habits and break a cycle of violence. However, the most obvious reason for banning all physical punishment of children is to prevent child abuse. If all parents are allowed to hit their children in the name of discipline, some parents will go too far and will inflict severe emotional and physical damage on their children. It may only be a small minority of parents, but we need to protect all our children.

In conclusion, parents have to change some of their beliefs and ideas about how children should be raised. It is possible to avoid the use of physical force in the home, and doing so will help us move closer to dream of removing violence from our society. *(474! Much too long! You only have one hour! But there is no penalty in IELTS for writing over 250 words in Task 2 - if you can do it!)*

66. Should parents use corporal punishment to discipline children?

Effective when used wisely

Many parents use physical punishment to discipline their children. Others prefer to use different methods to reward good behavior or punish misbehavior. This essay will look at some of the arguments for and against physical punishment of children.

It is often claimed that physical punishment will damage children in later life. Opponents of corporal punishment claim that the children will grow up to become delinquents or even beat their wives. However, many happily married adults today were slapped when they were younger but have never hit their spouses. Another point often made is that physical punishment teaches children that you can use force to make others do what you want. In fact children brought up well soon learn that force by itself is nothing - it must be associated with right. Finally, some people say that punishing a child by smacking him will damage the relationship between the child and the parents. This is clearly wrong. Children who understand the reasons for rules will be happier than children who are not given clear guidelines.

There are definitely concerns about physical punishment. Some parents lose control and can injure children - even breaking bones or causing bruises. Others can use violence excessively or as the only method of discipline. In this case, the child will be hurt, fearful and anxious and will not learn to distinguish right from wrong. The biggest problem with physical violence is when it is not appropriate to the age of the child. It can be very effective to quickly smack a two-year-old who is screaming. However, it is not effective to beat a 16-year-old who is late for school once again.

In conclusion, physical punishment can be a useful method of discipline. However it should be the last choice for parents. If we want to build a world with less violence we must begin at home, and we must teach our children to be responsible.

(317 words)

67. Should children be educated at home or in school?

Are parents really helping their children by teaching them at home?

In most countries in the world, governments require children to attend schools in which trained teachers are responsible for educating the children using an approved curriculum. However a significant number of parents believe that it is much better for their children to be educated at home by the people who know them and their needs best. This essay will examine the question of home schooling and discuss which the best option for the child is

An increasing number of parents are deciding that home schooling is the best option for their children. They are unhappy with the quality or depth of education offered in the schools, or have other reasons why they feel that traditional schools are not suitable for their children. One reason is social factors. Parents worry that their children will suffer from bullying or will be forced into antisocial behavior by peer pressure. They believe that the good behavior they have taught the child will be lost in school. Another reason is concern over the quality of schooling available. Schools frequently have large classes. They are often under-funded, and staffed by teachers without sufficient knowledge of their

subjects. Subjects such as the family's religion or language may not even be available in the school. Other parents may disagree with the aims of the school curriculum, preferring for academic, social or cultural reasons to keep their children separate. Finally, some children with special needs may need particular parental care.

However, there are many arguments in favor of sending children to conventional schools. The first is that the children will be exposed to other children. These children may represent either a cross-section of society or a narrow group, but in either case the children will interact with each other and develop social skills. A second point is that the children will learn to function outside the family. They will not be dependent on their parents for their educational, emotional and social needs. A third point is that the children will find it easier to integrate when they finish school, as they eventually will, when they start work or college.

Overall, while many parents work hard to teach their children at home, conventional schools are still the right choice for most children. Schools are not perfect, but they seem to be a proven way of preparing our children for the real world. (392 words)

68. Do children learn more quickly than adults?

Small children seem to learn very quickly, while adults sometimes appear to lose the ability to pick up new subject such as languages, music, games, or computer programs. In this essay, I will discuss whether children or adults make the best learners.

It is undoubtedly true that children seem to learn very quickly. In just a few years, they can learn how to play a musical instrument, speak one or even two new languages, and deal with many subjects at school. They even have time for sports and hobbies, and become experts in their favorite pastimes. However, how much of this is social pressure and how much is genetic? I am convinced that while children's brains have a natural ability to absorb new information as part of their developmental growth, much of their achievement is because of social pressure. Schools force them to take many subjects. Parents force them to practice new sports or to learn music. Even their playmates force them to become better at computer games or to read Harry Potter novels faster. In summary, children may enjoy learning, but their environment also is a big motivating factor.

Adults on the other hand are supposed to be poor learners. However, I disagree with people who say that adults cannot learn quickly. Adults have many skills that compensate for the decline in the ability of the brain to grasp and remember new material. They can organize their learning by setting times for reading or practice. They can build on skills and experiences they know already. Adults usually cannot learn to do ballet or to play the violin, but even despite these physical challenges, their motivation can often be higher than a child's. Unfortunately, society does not encourage many adults to learn. People are busy with families and work, and some adults may feel that further learning is pointless, since they have already achieved many goals at work or in their personal life.

In conclusion, I feel that we cannot generalize about children or adults being better learners. It depends on the situation and the motivation of the person, and the level of enthusiasm he or she has for learning. (360 words)

**69. Children who are brought up in the family that do not have a lot of money are better prepared to deal with problems when they become adults than children who are brought up by wealthy parent.
Do you agree or disagree with this statement?**

Gives reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own knowledge or experience.

Over the past few decades, along with growing interest in child education, people's attention to the family environment where a child is brought up has also significantly increased. Some people have begun to feel that a child who has grown up in a poor family tend to be better prepared to deal with problems. In my opinion, however, family environment alone does not much influence a child's ability to solve problems.

A child who was born into a poor family would have had more situations where they had to solve a problem or make a decision on their own. This is because in most unfortunate families, both parents are usually working and children are put into situations where they have to take care of themselves. By contrast, due to their wealth, rich children can experience and learn things that unfortunate children cannot. For example, they usually go to the best schools and receive a higher education there, which prepares them better for solving problems in their life.

However, few would disagree with the fact that each individual is different. That is, problem solving skills come more from life experience. That is, the more a person experiences in life, the more they can use these experiences to adjust, to adapt and to solve problems they encounter. Personality also can be a factor in dealing with problems. A person who is optimistic, outgoing, confident and open-minded can look at and solve problems more effectively.

As discussed above, nature and nurture have an equal influence on a child's ability to face challenges. Parents should spare no effort to figure out how they can help their children to be independent. I hope that in the future the next generation will grow up as mature citizens. (291 words)

YOUNG PEOPLE

70. A lot of people believe that the amount of violence shown on TV and in the cinema affects the actions of our young people and therefore increases the amount of violence in our society today. Do you agree or disagree with this statement? What can be done to reduce violence in our society today?

The question of whether the amount of violence on TV and cinema has affected young people in our society is something which cannot be quantified or proved. My opinion is though that the answer is "yes, it has".

TV and cinema today do show a large amount of violence and, although we try and shield our young people from seeing too much, they still get to watch it. At the age of eighteen in my country they can see everything anyway. Violence on the streets has increased. That has been proved. The connection between TV's and the cinema's obsession with violence and today's street violence cannot be proved but it is logical that the two are connected. Young people imitate what they see and it is logical that they see glamour in what they do when they commit violence.

How can we lessen violence? Reducing the amount of violence on TV and in the cinema would certainly be a good start. Being more vigilant about what age children are when they see violence in these media, and raising the age limits would also help. Another good idea would be to channel the violence of young people. I don't think that national service should be re-established in this country but, if people are convicted of violence and sent to prison, then why not give them the option of serving in the army. Their violence will be controlled and they will be subjected to discipline so that they will be better able to control themselves when they leave.

Thus I agree with the statement that cinema and TV violence affects the young people in our society. There are some things that can be done to better the situation but I doubt whether anything will be done.

(294 words)

71. Action movies with spectacular car chases are very popular with young people. it is often said that these sorts of movies lead to an increase in car accidents among young drivers as they try to copy what they have seen in the films. Do you agree that such movies increase the amount of bad driving? What can be done to encourage young people to drive more safely?

Movies tend to have a very large influence on young people who are influenced both by what they see and hear. Because this is the case, it is true that car chases in action movies tend to lead to an increase in the number of car accidents among young drivers because they try to copy what they have seen in the films. They drive too fast and take unnecessary risks and the difficulty is that most young people lack the skills and experience to do this.

There are a variety of ways in which young people can be encouraged to practise safer driving habits. Firstly, the Government should launch a safe driving campaign to convey the fact that driving safely is not uncool. In effect, it should be cool to stay alive and healthy! Secondly, every movie should make it clear that dangerous car chases are undertaken only in strict safety conditions with experienced drivers, and often special movie-making tricks are used to enhance the action. Thirdly, young people should be forced to take safe driving courses every year for the first five years that they have their driver's licence. In this way, they are forced to perfect their driving skills or their licence will be taken away.

Finally, as part of this course, young drivers should go to hospitals and witness the effects of poor or dangerous driving on other people. When they see hospitalised people whose lives have been destroyed due to stupid risk-taking, they will surely change their minds about whether it is cool to copy action heroes and drive fast.

264 words

OLD PEOPLE

72. In Britain, when someone gets old they often go to live in a home with other old people where there are nurses to look after them. Sometimes the government has to pay for this care.

Who should be responsible for our old people?

Many old people in Britain, after a lifetime of hard work and the toil of bringing up children, are put into homes for the elderly by their families. There, they are looked after by professional nurses, and this is sometimes at the expense of the government. However, this situation has raised controversy about whether we extend to our elders the care and respect they deserve.

The critics of this system say that it is the duty of the family to look after its senior members in the years when they are no longer able to work. They point out that in retirement homes old people tend to feel useless and unwanted by their family members, who seldom come to see them. In addition, there is evidence that younger people benefit from the experience and wisdom of older people who live with them on a daily basis.

On the other hand, those who support the system say that retired parents can be a burden to young families. Not only is it expensive to support old people who have little or no income, but the fact that old people are often ill and need a great deal of looking after can be too much for their busy children.

In my opinion, neither side is completely right. Old people in good health and with enough finances to support themselves can be a great help to their children. For instance, they can look after their grandchildren while children are out at work. On the other hand, sick and penniless old people are better off being looked after in retirement homes at government expense.

SOCIAL

73. Some people think that human needs for farmland, housing, and industry are more important than saving land for endangered animals. Do you agree or disagree with this point of view? Why or why not?

Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

As human population is significantly rising every year, people's requirements are increasing too. We need more food, more machines, more place to live. As a result of this people need more land to satisfy their requirements. We cultivate and irrigate more and more land to plant vegetables, build new buildings, airports, roads, etc. I think sometimes we forget that we are not alone on this planet. I have to disagree with those people who think that human needs are more important than saving land for endangered animals. I base my opinion on the following points.

First of all, as I already mentioned, we are not alone on this planet. A few centuries ago we were the part of wild nature. I think we need to remember this fact and respect all creatures around us.

Second of all, I believe that we all need to think of the problem of overpopulation. The human population is dramatically increasing and we have to do something about it. From my opinion, every family should have no more than two children. It will help to stop the growth of population, decrease human needs for farmland, housing and industry.

In conclusion, I think it is a very topical question nowadays. My point is that all people should answer this question and find the solution.

(218 words)

74. Trade and travel would be a lot easier with a single, global currency that we all use.

Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Would a single currency cause any problems?

It is clear to me that the idea of a single global currency is an excellent ideal to work towards. There can be no doubt that trade and travel would be vastly easier. On the other hand I believe that it would cause problems today.

The benefits of a single currency can be seen with the use in Europe of the Euro. Whenever you are travelling between countries using the Euro, the problems of currency changing and exchange rates are history. Similarly business between countries using the Euros is so much easier; no more worrying about exchange rate risk and pricing. Everyone's money is the same. The same thing is true with the US dollar. Most countries do not use the US dollar but it is accepted in many places. There are many countries that you can travel to and just take US dollars to use.

At present though a global currency would be impossible. Firstly most countries would not accept the idea. Secondly all countries are in different economic states. Some are economically very strong and some are in a state of collapse with inflation ruining the economy. Such countries could not be brought into a world currency as it would cause

massive financial instability worldwide. So it is clear that a global currency would indeed cause some serious problems.

So, in conclusion I see a global currency as a future ideal but it will not happen in my lifetime. It would make trade and travel much easier but the problems it would cause nowadays would be insurmountable.

(259 words)

**75. All education, primary, secondary and further education, should be free to all people and paid for by the government.
Do you agree or disagree with this statement?**

Different countries have different education systems. I don't know all the education systems in the world but all the ones I do know about have free school education at primary and secondary level. I certainly agree with the statement that this should be the case. I believe university education is different.

No matter what standard of income someone has or what society someone comes from, everyone should have the opportunity to have a good standard of education. This is not always what happens but it is what should happen. Private schools can be available for those who want and can afford it but the free schools should always be there. This is certainly one of the best attributes of western democracy and all countries it seems strive to attain situation although some have problems due to the economic and political situations in their countries. Governments should make sure that all their citizens have access to a good standard of free education at primary and secondary level.

Further education is different. In an ideal world this should be free but governments have a lot of demands on their money. I think that students should have to pay, maybe not all, but at least a contribution towards their tuition fees. They will be able to earn it back once they have graduated. The UK has this system whereas in the US students have to pay all their high tuition fees which can run into the tens of thousands of dollars over a full course. I am not sure if I agree with this but it certainly would make sure that students make the best of efforts to pass or all their money would be wasted.

Therefore I conclude that primary and secondary education should be freely available for all if possible but that further education should not necessarily be wholly free.

(309 words)

**76. "Although abuse of the system are inevitable, social welfare payments are essential to protect the rights citizens have to a guaranteed minimum income in a democratic society"
Discuss.**

Social welfare is an essential element of an advanced society. Good systems are always abused, but that does not mean they are faulty. In my opinion, the two main reasons why welfare payments are necessary are as follows:

First of all, critics forget that there are many forms of welfare besides payments to the unemployed. Their negative opinions harm those who are not capable of earning a wage, such as single-parent mothers, the disabled, and the sick. Moreover, the unemployed have the right to an income, too. They are not always at fault for not having a job, and in most cases the tax they have paid in the past entitles them to assistance.

The second reason is that crime increases when people have no means of support. The desperately poor inevitably turn to crime, which is not only dangerous but costly. Policing the streets is more expensive than providing welfare. A policeman's wage is four or five times higher than a "dole" payment.

Certain members of society believe that people should look after themselves. They point out that welfare increases dependency on others and destroys dignity. This may be true, but in the case of the unemployed, the relief payments are usually temporary. It is surely the fault of the government if there are long-term unemployed. Welfare critics also believe that it is the responsibility of a victim's family to provide financial assistance. However, it is too expensive to provide complete help for a severely disabled person.

To conclude, it is vital to understand the need for welfare in a modern democratic society. Without welfare payments the poor are destined to become poorer. The first duty of a government is to provide a financial safety net for all disadvantaged persons, and that includes those without work.

**77. The world is experiencing a dramatic increase in population, This is causing problems not only for poor, undeveloped countries, but also for industrialised and developing nations.
Describe some of the problems that overpopulation causes, and suggest at least one possible solution.**

In most countries of the world the population is increasing alarmingly. This is especially true in poor, undeveloped countries. Overpopulation causes a considerable number of problems.

In poor countries it is difficult to provide enough food to feed even the present number of people. In addition, education to limit the number of children per family is not always successful. Poorer countries usually have a lot of unemployment too, and an increase in population simply makes the situation worse. The environment also suffers when there are too many people living on the land.

In rich, industrialised and developing countries it is very difficult for governments to provide effective public services in overcrowded cities. Moreover, there is usually a great deal more crime, which is often due to high rates of unemployment. Further large increases in population only cause more overcrowding, unemployment and crime.

There are two main solutions to the overpopulation problem. Firstly, every woman who is pregnant, but who does not want to give birth, should be allowed by law to have an abortion. Secondly, governments must educate people to limit the size of the family. In China, couples are penalised financially if they have more than one child. This may seem cruel, but the "one-child policy" is beginning to have an effect in the world's most populous nation. Eventually, similar policies might also be necessary in other crowded nations such as India, for example.

To sum up, if the population explosion continues, many more people will die of starvation in poor countries, and life in the cities, even in affluent nations, will become increasingly difficult.

**78. The position of women in society has changed markedly in the last twenty years. Many of the problems young people now experience, such as juvenile delinquency, arise from the fact that many married women now work and are not at home to care for their children.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?**

It is certainly true that the position of women in society has undergone a dramatic change in the past twenty years but I do not feel that this is a direct cause of the indisputable increase in juvenile-related problems during this period.

It is now accepted that young women should find work on leaving school; indeed to rely totally on their parents' financial support is no longer an option in many families. Likewise, once they get married, the majority of women continue working since the financial pressures of setting up a house and establishing a reasonable standard of living often require two incomes.

Twenty years ago it was common for women to give up work once they had children and devote their time to caring for their children. This is no longer the general rule and the provision of professionally-run child care facilities and day nurseries have removed much of the responsibility for child rearing that used to fall to mothers. However, these facilities come at a cost and often require two salaries coming into a family to be afforded.

I do not believe that the increase in the number of working mothers has resulted in children being brought up less well than previously. Indeed it could be argued that by giving mothers the opportunity to work and earn extra money children can be better provided for than previously. There is more money for luxuries and holidays and a more secure family life is possible. Of course there are limits as to the amount of time that ideally should be spent away from home and the ideal scenario would be for one of the parents (often the wife) to have a part-time job and thus be available for their children before and after school. It is important to establish the correct balance between family life and working life.

79. Causes and Effects Worksheet: The Rainforest

by Julie Wallace, ADMC

Rainforest destruction is now recognized as one of the greatest environmental tragedies of all time. By why are the rainforests disappearing so quickly ?

- In 1800, there were 2.9 billion hectares of tropical forest worldwide. There are 1.5 billion hectares of tropical forest remaining.
- Almost 65% of Central America has been cleared to create pastureland for grazing cattle
- Rainforest land cleared for pasture or farming degrades quickly and is usually abandoned.
- At least 42 million acres of tropical forest are lost each year, approximately 100 acres/minute.
- Between 1960-1990, 445 million hectares of tropical forest were cleared.

We lose 50 species every day - 2 species per hour - due to tropical deforestation.

80. Why is fast-food so popular in the UAE? What are some of the implications for society?

Fast-food and the UAE

Past: In the past people in the UAE used to eat healthy, freshly prepared food with their families in the home. **Present:** Today however, many people, particularly young people, prefer to eat fast food such as hamburgers, fried chicken, shawarma, or pizza. **TOPIC SENTENCE:** There are many reasons why this change has occurred, but fast-food also has some serious effects on individuals and society.

Causes Topic Sentence: There are many reasons for the popularity of fast food. **Cause 1:** One of the main reasons is the change in lifestyle. **Example 1a:** Many people in the UAE are working long hours, shifts, or extended school days. They don't have time to find ingredients or prepare good food. **Example 1b:** Women are now starting to work in the Emirates, and this can result in less time being available for preparing family meals. **Cause 2:** Another cause is the huge number of young, affluent people in the UAE. **Example 2:** The rapid development of the country has meant that young people, who comprise over 75% of the population, have money to spend. **Cause 3:** A third reason is advertising. **Example 3:** The UAE is a very modern, free-market country, with all forms of media such as the Internet and satellite television, and people like to try new products and different kinds of fast food.

Effects Topic Sentence: However, this change in diet can have some serious effects. **Effect 1:** One effect is on health. **Example 1:** Many individuals in the UAE are becoming obese. These people will be less productive and have conditions such as heart disease and diabetes. **Effect 2:** Another result of fast food is the loss of the family tradition of

eating together. **Example 2:** Children and adults rarely eat together now, and thus get less opportunity to talk. **Effect 3:** A further effect is economic. **Example 3a:** Although fast food is not very expensive, it is more expensive than cooking properly for yourself. **Example 3b:** Many of the fast-food companies are franchisees of foreign corporations, so profits leave the country.

Conclusion: Summary: In conclusion, fast food, although it is convenient and a tasty addition to a diet, can have serious health and social effects. **Future statement:** People should learn to choose fast food carefully and remember the pleasure of eating good food in good company.

81. Without capital punishment (the death penalty) our lives are less secure and crimes of violence increase. Capital punishment is essential to control violence in society.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

Before talking about the essential role of death penalty, you have to think about the meaning, and the purpose, of any kind of punishment. If you consider that the purpose is to prevent the guilty from being nasty again, you can be seduced by an argumentation in favour of the suppression of capital punishment. But you have to think about another aspect of the problem: a punishment is also useful to impress people, to make them fear the law. In fact, let's take the example of a young misfit, which has grown in a violent atmosphere, influenced by older delinquents, etc ... He lives in the streets, he's got no aim but to survive. This is the kind of person who could possibly kill someone for money, or even for fun ... Why would he fear prison? Life would be easier for him there. In addition, in many cases, when you behave normally, you can benefit from penalty reductions. This young misfit needs to be impressed, he needs to know that the law is a frontier. When you cross it, you can lose your life. That is why capital punishment helps keeping a distance between robbery and murder. If you abolish it, you suppress the difference between these two types of crime, which are completely different.

But there is also a limit to define: even if death penalty is unavoidable, it would be a crime to apply it to inadequate cases. If there is no premeditation or past facts which can justify such a punishment, it is far too strict to apply death penalty. That is why the lawmakers have to establish precisely the context in which capital punishment can be pronounced. That is the price to pay to limit violence without using excessive violence.

Capital punishment is always associated with ignorance and intolerance. In fact, we must acknowledge that some people disagree with this kind of penalty but others are totally in favour. Portugal was the first European country to end this kind of penalty. Since the 19th century, tolerance and respect for life are important values. Moreover, we can affirm that all the Europe remains under the same codes. Maybe because of a religious view point, life respect is a typical value in the Old Catholic world.

Those who are in favour of capital punishment are particularly in radical countries. It is not surprising to watch some barbarian behaviours in Islamic countries like public stoning to death. The population is invited to participate on the trial and in the final sentence - death-itself. However, this is not just an image of third world countries. Actually, USA is where

this kind of punishment has its higher rates. The state of Texas, in particular, is at the top, supporting this measure against crime, especially those related with serial killers and those involving children. In a society dominated by fear and government control, it is foreseen that this penalty will continue into a future next.

Maybe this is not a clear question. As we can see there are several values here and of course cultural behaviours. The roots of the question are religious, cultural, ethical and even geographical. The world is divided and the law systems show those divisions. The solutions, however can lead us to other questions concerning revenge and justice. It will be better to kill a person because of his crimes? Can we admit that life sentence could be a much better sentence? In fact, rehabilitation is the right way especially with an accurate psychological evaluation first. Some people are lost forever, and in my opinion some murderers and other perverted people will suffer more in jail. In this sense, capital punishment is a soft release.

This is a very good essay, you should do well in the Task 2 Writing Test.

FAMILY

82. In some countries, marriages are arranged by the parents but in other cases, people choose their own marriage partner. Discuss both systems.

The idea that a marriage should be arranged by the parents of the couple, or by other members-of the family, is quite acceptable to some societies, yet completely out of the question for others. It all depends on your cultural expectations.

In so-called western societies, it is very unusual for marriages to be arranged. Most young people would not welcome the idea that their parents have the right to choose their partner for life. They feel that arranged marriages deny them their fundamental right to choose, even if they make a bad decision.

However, if we are honest about it, we might acknowledge that some parents organise their children's lives in such a way that they are likely to meet and marry partners the parents approve of. It could be said that this is, to some extent, similar to an arranged marriage. It is always better when families support the relationship and welcome the grandchildren.

People for whom arranged marriages are the cultural norm often argue that the likelihood of the marriage lasting is greater when it is set up in this manner. Parents can be assured that their children are joining a family of similar standing and cultural background, and this, in the long run, makes for a more stable society if your parents' marriage was arranged, and has worked well, then why should you question the custom?

The important thing to ensure is that people are never forced into a marriage which will make them unhappy or lead to an unequal relationship where one partner is exploited by the other. This applies in all societies and situations.

(269 words)

83. Many people believe that women make better parents than men and that this is why they have the greater role in raising children in most societies. Others claim that men are just as good as women at parenting. Write an essay expressing your point of view.

The view that women are better parents than men has shown itself to be true throughout history. This is not to say that men are not of importance in child-rearing indeed, they are most necessary if children are to appreciate fully the roles of both sexes. But women have proven themselves superior parents as a result of their conditioning, their less aggressive natures and their generally better communication skills.

From the time they are little girls, females learn about nurturing. First with dolls and later perhaps with younger brothers and sisters, girls are given the role of carer. Girls see their mothers in the same roles and so it is natural that they identify this as a female activity. Boys, in contrast, learn competitive roles far removed from what it means to nurture. While boys may dream of adventures, girls' conditioning means they tend to see the future in terms of raising families.

Girls also appear to be less aggressive than boys. In adulthood, it is men, not women, who prove to be the aggressors in crime and in war. Obviously, in raising children, a more patient, gentle manner is preferable to a more aggressive one. Although there certainly exist gentle men and aggressive women, by and large, females are less likely to resort to violence in attempting to solve problems.

Finally, women tend to be better communicators than men. This is shown in intelligence tests, where females, on average, do better in verbal communication than males. Of course, communication is of utmost importance in rearing children, as children tend to learn from and adopt the communication styles of their parents.

Thus, while it is all very well to suggest a greater role for men in raising children, let us not forget that women are generally better suited to the parenting role.

84. It is generally acknowledged that families are now not as close as they used to be.

Give possible reasons and your recommendations.

There is much discussion nowadays as to whether or not the relationship between family members is as close as before. Diverse contributing factors can be identified. In the following, I would like to present my point of view.

Great changes have taken place in family life along with the development of society. One of them is that the once-extended family tends to become smaller and smaller. Many children have to leave their parents at an early age to study or work elsewhere. As time passes, children become emotionally estranged from their parents.

Compared with the past, social competition is becoming increasingly fierce. People are urged to concentrate their efforts upon work, so that they can achieve success, or at least a good standard of living. As a result, they can't afford to spend their leisure hours with their families. The importance of bonds of kinship is gradually fading from their minds.

In addition, the availability of various kinds of recreational facilities also diverts people from enjoying chats with the members of their families. Their free time is mostly occupied by watching TV, surfing the Internet or playing video games. They come to lose interest in communicating with the other members of their families.

In view of such alienation within families, urgent steps must be taken, in my opinion. For members of families who live away from one another, regular contact on the phone can bring them the care that they need. Family reunions on holidays or other important occasions can make a difference as well. For those living together, it is a good idea to take some time off work or recreation periods to spend more time with each other. In the final analysis, a close family relationship can surely be maintained as long as we realize the significant role it plays in our lives and attach importance to it.

85. "Fatherhood ought to be emphasised as much as motherhood. The idea that women are solely responsible for deciding whether or not to have babies leads on to the idea that they are also responsible for bringing the children up."

To what extent do you agree or disagree?

believe that child-rearing should be the responsibility of both parents and that, whilst the roles within that partnership may be different, they are nevertheless equal in importance. In some societies, it has been made easier over the years for single parents to raise children on their own. However, this does not mean that the traditional family, with both parents providing emotional support and role-models for their children, is not the most satisfactory way of bringing up children.

Of crucial importance, in my opinion, is how we define 'responsible for bringing the children up'. At its simplest, it could mean giving the financial support necessary to provide a home, food and clothes and making sure the child is safe and receives an adequate education. This would be the basic definition.

There is, however, another possible way of defining that part of the quotation. That would say it is not just the fathers responsibility to provide the basics for his children, while his wife involves herself in the everyday activity of bringing them up. Rather, he should share those daily duties, spend as much time as his job allows with his children, play with them, read to them, help directly with their education, participate very fully in their lives and encourage them to share his.

It is this second, fuller, concept of 'fatherhood' that I am in favour of, although I also realise how difficult it is to achieve sometimes. The economic and employment situation in many countries means that jobs are getting more, not less, stressful, requiring long hours and perhaps long journeys to work as well. Therefore it may remain for many a desirable ideal rather than an achievable reality.

CULTURE

86. Some people think that it is important to have a single language as an international official language. Others think that it will make it difficult to identify countries and cause a loss of culture. What are your opinions on this?

With the advent of globalization, a common language to facilitate trade and communication seems inevitable. Some oppose the development of a single language on the grounds that it may lead to cultural erosion and a loss of local linguistic knowledge. Yet, I am of the opinion that it is possible to use an official international language and still retain one's own language and culture.

Firstly, many countries already use an official language or languages. For example, in India there are two official languages: Hindi and English. In a country such as India where there are innumerable languages spoken, there is a need for official languages to ensure communication between different sections of the population and the different states. In China, where different dialects are spoken, Mandarin, the official language, enables people from different provinces to comprehend each other.

Secondly, in an age of rampant globalization there is no doubt that an international language is inevitability. How is an African businessman going to conduct business in China when there are such differences between languages? In this sense, not only is an international language inevitable, but also a necessity for trade, commerce and economic expansion in the 21st century.

The critics opposing the adoption of an international official language argue that it would lead to a loss of cultural identity. However, the use of an international official language doesn't mean that local languages will die out. For example, English already functions as a kind of unofficial international language but this doesn't mean that people solely converse in English or they neglect their own language. English is used in specific contexts (trade, business, etc) and native languages are used for everyday instruction.

In brief, as the world becomes smaller the need for an official international language seems unavoidable. English has already assumed this role although its status is unofficial. In my view, the use of either an official or unofficial international language is necessary to facilitate communication in a time of rapid globalization.

(330 words)

87. Describe a custom from your country that you would like people from other countries to adopt. Explain your choice, using specific reasons and examples.

In our modern stressful world we often forget about our customs and traditions. However, I think that people should keep their traditions because they help to remember our forefathers and value the beautiful moments we have in our lives.

In my country we have a great custom called "Maslenica". It is a holiday, which is celebrated at the end of the winter. Many people gather on the biggest square of the city and see of the winter. They say to the winter good-bye and ask the spring to change the winter. They celebrate the beginning of the life when everything starts to grow.

People at this holiday bake pancakes and treat each other with them. Also, many people gathered on the square play different games. For example, the most well-known game "pulling a rope" subsists in that two teams pull a rope. The winner is the team, witch has a longer rope. Other people draw on the icy pole. People have fun at this holiday even if they just observe those games and do not participate.

In conclusion, I am sure that "Maslenica" would benefit many countries all over the world. People have the opportunity to relax, leave their troubles and worries behind and have fun. Also, this holiday helps people to find out more about each other, communicate and meet new people. In addition to those practical benefits, "Maslenica" helps people to slow down their life pace and enjoy the present moments that are irreplaceable and beautiful.(248 words)

88. When people move to another country, some of them decide to follow the customs of the new country.

Others prefer to keep their own customs. Compare these two choices.

Which one do you prefer? Support your answer with specific details.

People may choose to keep their old traditions from their native country or to accept new ones. Keeping the old customs will help one to overcome the cultural shock and the change of the environment. From the other side, accepting the new traditions will help one to adapt and make new friends with residents. In this essay I will give different reasons why people decide to follow the customs of the new country or to keep their own customs.

If one is from the country with strong and old traditions, I think it will be rather difficult for him to adapt to the new customs and moreover to reject his own. That is why some people from the same country try to live together and to create their own community where the old traditions are kept. They can not break the customs that were created by their ancestors. For example, some nations are restricted in certain kinds of food by their traditions. So, they do not go to the restaurants unless their traditional food is served there. Some nations according to their customs have to wear certain types of cloth because their religion tells them to do so.

From the other side, if one is from the country with traditions similar to ones of the new country it will be easy for him to adopt and to follow the customs of the new place. He will not feel much difference. Probably, the most difficult part of his relocation will be to accustom to the new climate.

I think that people of the new country are friendlier when they see that foreigner follows their customs. I belief that traditions of every country deserve respect, especially, when one lives there. In summary, I think that every country has its own beauty and if one wants to find out more about it he will love it.

(313 words)

**89. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Modern technology is creating a single world culture.
Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.**

Man, through the ages, has undergone many changes from the time when he depicted a herd of mammoths on the walls of the cave to these days when he can chat with someone on the other side of the globe. Modern technology is rapidly changing the world's living standards that results in creating a single world culture. New technologies including Internet, television, electronic media, means of transportation, etc has a great impact on creating a similar culture all around the globe. Bellow I will list my reasons to support my opinion.

First of all, Internet and e-mail have changed the way people communicate to each other. Internet brought many benefits. It is a new means of communication, a fast access to information and news. People communicate with each other, share their ideas, happiness and difficulties. We have a great opportunity to find out more about countries and their history.

Second of all, the modern means of transportation allows people to move from one place to another very quickly. A few centuries ago it was impossible to imagine waking up in one country and falling asleep in another.

Finally, as a result of all mentioned above the boundaries between countries, their traditions and customs are erased. Many people migrate during their lives. Some of them are looking for a better place to live, others want to get new experience and knowledge or just pleasure. So, many families are created between people from different countries. Traditions fuse and evolve into other ones or just vanish.

To sup up, modern technology has a great impact on the way people live now. It is creating a new single world culture where traditions and distances are no longer of that importance.

(286 words)

DRUG

90. Some businesses now say that no one can smoke cigarettes in any of their offices. Some governments have banned smoking in all public places. Do you agree or disagree? Give reasons.

Most of the firms, organization and companies as well as Government make restrictions to smoke in work places and public amenities respectively. It has become fashionable in the world today to blame smoking. However, although I feel that smoking can be harmful, but I don't think it should be forbidden completely. I would also argue that people should have the right whether they smoke or not.

Let me deal with the three positive sides of smoking. Firstly, smoking certainly helps many people to relax. For some, it even improves concentration. If someone is upset owing to debt or they have exam, like to smoke to reduce the pressure or tension. Most of the people like to smoke when they are relaxing with friends. Secondly, governments throughout the world make huge profits from taxes on cigarettes. The income obtained from taxes provide funds which are used for building school, hospital and public places such as parks, gardens, sports ground and foot paths. Thirdly, tobacco industry also employs tens of thousands of people all over the world, particularly in poorer countries like Zimbabwe or India. Without cigarettes, these people would have no jobs.

Despite these positive effects there are lots of negative effects of smoking too. Initially, smoking has been proven to be too dangerous for health. As one cigarette contain more than 4000 chemical substances, therefore, it causes for many injurious diseases like heart attacks, asthma, bronchitis, lung cancer and cough. According to the current report, in Britain about 3,500 people are killed each year in road accidents and 120,000 are killed by smoking. Furthermore, smoking costs government millions of dollars because of the large number of people who need treatment in hospitals for smoking-related problems. Moreover, there is also concern today about passive smoking. Recent research shows that non-smokers can suffer health problems if they spend long period of time among people who do smoke. In UK children whose parents are smoke are three times as likely to start smoking themselves _.

In short, I think the world would be a better place without cigarettes. However, the decision as to whether _ smoke or not should be for each individual to make. I suggest people should not smoke in a room or place where there are non smokers but surely they should be free to smoke elsewhere.

This a very good essay, you have made your arguments well and set the paragraphs out as required. However, take care with your use of definitive statements e.g. Without cigarettes, these people would have no jobs. Maybe they would gain employment in another industry, we cannot be sure. Over all, well done!

- **91. Should the same laws which prohibit the sale and consumption of heroin be applied to tobacco?**

Recently, a hostile debate arose when a few well-reputable health organizations suggested the application of a similar act of heroin selling and usage prohibition. In this essay, I will analyse why the adoption of such a law could be a breakthrough in our youngsters' safety, according to my vision.

Firstly, tobacco does not differ much from heroin when it comes to the later addictive effect. Nicotine, the active ingredient in tobacco, exerts its effect by acting directly on smoker's brain cells. Numerous experiments carried out by scientists on animals, specially rats, proved that this toxic chemical does lead by time to dependency, just similar to the effect experienced with heroin.

Secondly, restriction on cigarettes selling will surely show an instant decline in tobacco smoking. "Having an easy access to cigarettes puts a tremendous pressure, specially on teenagers, to resist such a temptation" Dr. Hisham, head of Psychology department at Alexandria Medical college, states firmly. "Giving the new generation the sense that the severity of smoking is equivalent to other lethal drugs usage would be a life saving step, they will thank us for() as they get older." he continues.

To recapitulate, applying of a futuristic law as the suggested one will definitely have a positive impact, not only on young people's health but on our society as a whole.

Well done! This is a very good essay but take care of your spelling.

92. People in all modern societies use drugs, but today's youth are experimenting with both legal and illegal drugs, and at an increasingly early age. Some sociologists claim that parents and other members of society often set a bad example.

Discuss the causes and some effects of widespread drug use by young people in modern day society. Make any recommendations you feel are necessary to help fight youth drug abuse.

Youth drug abuse is a serious problem nowadays in many cultures. Not only is illegal drug use on the rise, but children as young as 10 years old are experimenting with alcohol and tobacco. The reasons for this behaviour are unclear, but certain sociologists blame the examples set by their elders.

Parents who drink and smoke to excess are, in effect, telling their children that it is acceptable to abuse their bodies with drugs. Consequently, children may have a similar view towards illegal drugs, even if their parents are against their use. In addition, drug use shown on television and in films can only confuse children who are also taught at school that drug abuse is wrong.

The pressure on young people to perform well at school in order to compete for jobs is a possible cause of the problem. Many believe they cannot live up to their parents' expectations, and feel a sense of hopelessness. Also, the widespread availability of drugs means teenagers are faced with the temptation to experiment. Drugs are used as a means of expressing dissatisfaction with the pressures they face in society.

The effects of drug abuse are well known. Many young people's talents are wasted, and

addiction to hard drugs can cost a user his or her life. Furthermore, those who drink and drive may be involved in fatal road accidents. The cost to society is great, and enormous amounts of money are spent on convicting drug dealers and on education programmes.

To conclude, I recommend that the only sensible way to solve this problem is to educate young people about the dangers of drug use, and to take steps to reduce the pressure of competition placed upon them.

93. Drug abuse is becoming a problem in our society. What are the causes of this and what are some solutions?

Drug abuse is rife in many countries. Billions of dollars are spent internationally preventing drug use, treating addicts, and fighting drug-related crime. Although drugs threaten many societies, their effects can also be combated successfully. This essay looks at some of the effects of drug use on society, and suggests some solutions to the problem.

Drug abuse causes multiple problems for countries and communities. The medical and psychological effects are very obvious. Addicts cannot function as normal members of society. They neglect or abuse their families, and eventually require expensive treatment or hospitalization. The second effect is on crime. Huge police resources are needed to fight smuggling and dealing. Criminal gangs and mafia underworlds develop with the money from drugs.

However, the menace of drugs can be fought. Education is the first battle. Children need to be told at home and in school about drugs. People need to be aware of the effects so that they can make avoid this problem. A second approach is to increase police manpower and powers to stop dealers and to enforce the law. However the main target should be the user. Families and counselors need to talk to children and people at risk. Parents need to look at their children and help them to Jobs are needed to give people a role in society.

In conclusion, although the problem of drugs may seem impossible to eliminate, there are concrete steps that can be taken to weaken the hold of drugs on society. The danger from drugs is too great to ignore.

256 words

94. Should Smoking be Banned?

It has become fashionable in the world today to condemn smoking. However, although I feel that smoking can be harmful, I do not think it should be banned completely.

Let me deal first with the positive side of smoking. First, smoking undoubtedly helps many people to relax. For some, it even improves concentration. Many people like to smoke before exams or when they are relaxing with friends.

A further point is that governments throughout the world make huge profits from levying taxes on cigarettes. This provides funds which are used for building schools, hospitals and other public amenities.

The tobacco industry also employs tens of thousands of people throughout the world, particularly in poorer countries like Zimbabwe or India. Without cigarettes, these people would have no jobs.

I would also argue that people should have the right to choose whether they smoke or not. People should not smoke in a room where there are non-smokers but surely they should be free to smoke elsewhere.

The arguments against smoking are well known. Smoking has been shown to be dangerous to health. Heart disease, bronchitis and lung cancer have all been linked.

A further issue is that smoking costs governments millions of pounds because of the large number of people who need treatment in hospitals for smoking related problems.

There is also concern today about passive smoking. Recent research has shown that non-smokers can suffer health problems if they spend long periods of time among people who do smoke.

In general, I think the world would be a better place without cigarettes. However, the decision as to whether to smoke or not should be for each individual to make.

HEALTH

95. Smokers can cause themselves serious health problems. The choice to smoke is made freely and with knowledge of dangers. Smokers should therefore expect to pay more for medical treatment than non-smokers.

Everyone has the choice of being a smoker or not. The people who choose to smoke do so knowing there is a risk of causing harmful damage to themselves. However, I do not entirely agree that these people should have to pay more to receive all the medical treatment they need.

I think there are many situations in which a medical problem has nothing to do with whether a person smokes or not. In these cases, where an illness has no relation to smoking, then I believe that smokers should not be required to pay more than other people for their medical treatment. Most car accidents, for example, have no connection with smoking, and the people who are injured ought to have the same medical help, regardless of the cost. And what about the common flu - it does not seem justifiable to me that a smoker should have to pay more to see a doctor for an illness we can all contract.

On the other hand, I agree that a smoker should pay more than a non-smoker for the necessary treatment of any condition which has been caused by smoking. The principle that people should take responsibility for their own actions is a good one. Consequently, if a person chooses to smoke knowing that this habit can cause serious health problems, then there is no reason why the community or an insurance company should have to pay for medical treatment for an illness which could have been avoided.

In many countries, cigarette packets have a clear warning that smoking can cause health problems and so no smoker can claim not to know the danger. Lung cancer is sometimes a fatal disease and the treatment is both lengthy and expensive, and it is unfair for the smoker to expect the hospital or the community to carry the cost. In fact, it could also be argued that those who smoke in public should be asked to pay extra because of the illness caused to passive smokers.

In conclusion, I feel that smokers should pay more in cases related to smoking, but for any other illness they should pay the same as anyone else.

**96. Should parents be obliged to immunise their children against childhood diseases?
Or do individuals have the right to choose not to immunise their children?**

Some people argue that the state does not have the right to make parents immunise their children. However, I feel the question is not whether they should immunise but whether, as members of society, they have the right not to.

Preventative medicine has proved to be the most effective way of reducing the incidence of fatal childhood diseases. As a result of the widespread practice of immunising young children in our society, many lives have been saved and the diseases have been reduced to almost zero.

In previous centuries children died from ordinary illnesses such as influenza and tuberculosis and because few people had immunity, the diseases spread easily. Diseases such as dysentery were the result of poor hygiene but these have long been eradicated since the arrival of good sanitation and clean water. Nobody would suggest that we should reverse this good practice now because dysentery has been wiped out.

Serious diseases such as polio and smallpox have also been eradicated through national immunisation programmes. In consequence, children not immunised are far less at risk in this disease-free society than they would otherwise be. Parents choosing not to immunise are relying on the fact that the diseases have already been eradicated. If the number of parents choosing not to immunise increased, there would be a similar increase in the risk of the diseases returning.

Immunisation is not an issue like seatbelts which affects only the individual. A decision not to immunise will have widespread repercussions for the whole of society and for this reason, I do not believe that individuals have the right to stand aside. In my opinion immunisation should be obligatory.

* The issue of whether we should force parents to immunise their children against common diseases is, in my opinion, a social rather than a medical question. Since we are free to choose what we expose our bodies to in the way of food, drink, or religion for that matter, why should the question of medical 'treatment' be any different?

Medical researchers and governments are primarily interested in overall statistics and trends and in money-saving schemes which fail to take into consideration the individual's concerns and rights. While immunisation against diseases such as tetanus and whooping cough may be effective, little information is released about the harmful effects of vaccinations which can sometimes result in stunted growth or even death.

The body is designed to resist disease and to create its own natural immunity through contact with that disease. So when children are given artificial immunity, we create a vulnerable society which is entirely dependent on immunisation. In the event that mass immunisation programmes were to cease, the society as a whole would be more at risk than ever before.

In addition there is the issue of the rights of the individual. As members of a society, why should we be obliged to subject our children to this potentially harmful practice? Some people may also be against immunisation on religious grounds and their needs must also be considered.

For these reasons I feel strongly that immunisation programmes should not be obligatory and that the individual should have the right to choose whether or not to participate.

97. "Prevention is better than cure."

Out of a country's health budget, a large proportion should be diverted from treatment to spending on health education and preventative measures.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

Of course it goes without saying that prevention is better than cure. That is why, in recent years, there has been a growing body of opinion in favour of putting more resources into

health education and preventive measures. The argument is that ignorance of, for example, basic hygiene or the dangers of an unhealthy diet or lifestyle needs to be combatted by special nationwide publicity campaigns, as well as longer-term health education.

Obviously, there is a strong human argument for catching any medical condition as early as possible. There is also an economic argument for doing so. Statistics demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of treating a condition in the early stages, rather than delaying until more expensive and prolonged treatment is necessary. Then there are social or economic costs, perhaps in terms of loss of earnings for the family concerned or unemployed benefit paid by the state.

So far so good, but the difficulties start when we try to define what the 'proportion' of the budget should be, particularly if the funds will be 'diverted from treatment'. Decisions on exactly how much of the total health budget should be spent in this way are not a matter for the non-specialist, but should be made on the basis of an accepted health service model.

This is the point at which real problems occur - the formulation of the model. How do we accurately measure which health education campaigns are effective in both medical and financial terms? How do we agree about the medical efficacy of various screening programmes, for example, when the medical establishment itself does not agree? A very rigorous process of evaluation is called for, so that we can make informed decisions.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

98. Studying the English language in an English-speaking country is the best but not the only way to learn language.

Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

Studying a language in a country where it is widely spoken has many advantages. It is, therefore, a good idea to study English in a country such as Britain. However, I believe it is not the only way to learn the language.

In the first place, most students in non-English-speaking countries learn English at secondary school, and sometimes at university nowadays. Although their spoken English is not usually of a very high standard, their knowledge of grammar is often quite advanced. This is certainly useful when students come to an English-speaking country to perfect the language.

Secondly, studying the basics of English at secondary school is less stressful than learning the language while overseas. This is because students living at home do not have to worry about problems such as finding accommodation, paying for their study and living costs, and trying to survive in a foreign country where day to day living causes much stress.

However, there are obvious advantages of learning English in Britain. Every day there are opportunities to practise listening to and speaking with British people. Also, students can experience the culture firsthand, which is a great help when trying to understand the language. This is especially true if they choose to live with a British family, as exchange students for example. Furthermore, if students attend a language school full-time, the teachers will be native speakers. In this case, not only will students' speaking and listening skills improve, but attention can be given to developing reading and writing skills as well.

In general, even though it is preferable to study English in an English-speaking country, a reasonable level of English can be achieved in one's own country, if a student is gifted and dedicated to study.

99. Learning a foreign language offers an insight into how people from other cultures think and see the world. The teaching of a foreign language should be compulsory at all primary schools.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this view?

Clear statement followed by a question based on the premise.)

Language is linked to the identity of a nation, and speakers of a common language share many things, but does this give governments the right to restrict the way a language is used or taught?

(Concession made to the "For" case, but followed by the 'Against' point of view. An example is given which comments on the likely effectiveness of such a policy.)

It can be argued that a nation maintains its culture through its language, and so there is a need to restrict the use of foreign words and changes in pronunciation. However, in reality

this approach is fruitless, because language is a living thing and it is impossible to stop it from changing. This policy has been tried in some countries, but it never works. People, especially young people, will use the language that they hear around them, and which separates them from others; stopping the use of certain words will only make them appear more attractive.

(Puts the case Against' governments preventing spelling reform, but concedes it may be useful.)

As for spelling, we all know that the English system is irregular and, I believe, it would benefit from simplification so that children and other learners do not waste time learning to read and write. On the other hand, some people may feel, perhaps rightly, that it is important to keep the original spelling of words as a link with the past and this view is also held by speakers of languages which do not use the Roman alphabet.

(Puts both sides of the argument about which language to use in schools.)

While it is important for people who speak a minority language to be able to learn and use that language, it is practical for education to be in a common language. This creates national pride and links people within the society. Realistically, schools are the best place for this to start.

(Ends with a clear statement.)

Ultimately, there is a role for governments to play in the area of language planning, particularly in education, but at no time should governments impose regulations which restrict people's linguistic freedom.

100. Millions of people every year move to English-speaking countries such as Australia, Britain or America, in order to study at school, college or university. Why do so many people want to study in English? Why is English such an important international language?

I am not surprise when I read in the newspapers that many people move to English speaking countries. I am an engineer in a process control since ten years and I understand the necessity of English language. For example, when I read technical English specifications, when I meet Japanese Industrials to build together some electronic materials or when I go on holidays in Italy where the best way (for me) to communicate is to speak English. Therefore, today, it's necessary to learn English and the best way is to study in English as soon as possible when we are at school but also when we have a job. It's so Important to communicate with foreigners, because of work. For example: to seafoods in USA, to build electronic cards with the Japanese, to obtain a certification with FDA (American organization) in order to sell some pharmaceutical products. In fact, jt's Important for everybody, the workers, the visitors, the scientists, etc ...

These are the main reason which explain why so many people go to English speaking countries (the best way to learn) and why English is such an Important International language (the communication between many the people over the world).

Comment:

This is an answer written by a candidate who achieved a **Band 6** score. Here is the examiner's comment:

This response is underlength and is marked down because of this. Only a few relevant ideas are presented and these are used rather repetitively and are insufficiently developed or supported. However, the writing communicates fluently and a satisfactory range of structures and vocabulary are used.

ETHICAL ISSUES

101. By punishing murderers with the death penalty, society is also guilty of committing murder. Therefore, life in prison is a better punishment for murderers. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? (AGREE)

"Do as I say, not as I do." This is what society tells us when it punishes murderers with the death penalty. Society tells us that murder is wrong, and in our legal system, murder is against the law. Yet we still see our society kill murderers, and thus we are committing murder ourselves. For this reason, the death penalty should end, and instead murderers should be punished with life in prison.

Society needs to show a positive model of how our lives should be and how people should act. We should always strive to improve our situation, to be at peace and in harmony with others. However, when we kill murderers, we are not working to improve our society. Instead, we are stooping to the criminals' level.

It makes me think about the revenge that came when playing games with my brothers. When we were kids/children, my brother would take my toys, so I would hit him and take my toys back. Then he would hit me harder and take the toys again. Thinking of the death penalty, I imagine a murderer kills someone. Society takes revenge by killing the murderer. This leaves behind the murderer's family and friends, who have tremendous anger inside of them, which they may release onto society. The cycle of killing goes on and on.

Society should not condemn people who are taking the same action that society is taking. Society tells us not to kill, and yet society kills when it exercises the death penalty. Because of this contradiction, we should end the death penalty and instead punish murderers by sentencing them to life in prison.

(273 words)

102. Should animals be used in testing new drugs and procedures?

Every year, millions of animals undergo painful suffering or death as a result of scientific research into the effects of drugs, food additives, cosmetics and other chemical products. While most people think animal testing is necessary, others are upset by what they see as needless suffering. This essay looks at some of the positive and negative aspects of animal testing.

Many medical treatments and procedures have been developed from experiments on animals. Since animals share many features with humans, scientists use animals to test the safety and effectiveness of newly developed drugs before pilot testing on small groups of patients. Medical teams practice new operating techniques such as transplants on animals. Without animal testing, many procedures or new drugs would be extremely unsafe.

However, many people are concerned that animals are suffering unnecessarily and

cruelly. They do not believe that every new drug needs to be tested on animals, especially with the huge database of knowledge and modern computer models. They also are worried that many animal tests are ineffective, pointing out that any drugs have had to be withdrawn from the market despite extensive testing. They particularly feel that animal testing should not be used for non-essential products such as cosmetics, shampoos, soaps, and cleaning products. Furthermore, some campaigners would like to see certain tests replaced and more humane methods used.

We need to make sure that the millions of animals who are used for testing new products are treated with the minimum of suffering. Although some animal testing may be unavoidable at present, treating our fellow creatures as mercifully as possible will demonstrate our humanity.

Animal Testing : yes

Every day, thousands of people are saved from painful diseases and death by powerful medical drugs and treatments. This incredible gift of medicine would not be possible without animal testing. Despite these overwhelming benefits, however, some people are calling for animal testing to be banned because of alleged cruelty. This essay will examine arguments for and against animal testing.

Those against the use of animal testing claim that it is inhumane to use animals in experiments. I disagree completely. It would be much more inhumane to test new drugs on children or adults. Even if it were possible, it would also take much longer to see potential effects, because of the length of time we live compared to laboratory animals such as rats or rabbits.

Opponents of animal testing also claim that the results are not applicable to humans. This may be partly true. Some drugs have had to be withdrawn, despite testing. However, we simply do not have alternative methods of testing. Computer models are not advanced enough, and testing on plants is much less applicable to humans than tests on animals such as monkeys. Until we have a better system, we must use animal testing.

A further point often raised against animal testing is that it is cruel. Some of the tests certainly seem painful, but the great majority of people on this planet eat meat or wear leather without any guilt. Where is their sympathy for animals? Furthermore, animals clearly do not feel the same way as humans, and scientists are careful to minimize stress in the animals, since this would damage their research.

I agree that we need to make sure that animals who are used for testing new products have the minimum of suffering. However, I am convinced that animal testing is necessary, and that it will continue to benefit humans in new and wonderful ways.

Animal Testing : no

Advantages of Animal Testing in Medical Research

Medical research involving animals has dramatically improved the health of the human race. Without animal testing, the cure for polio would not exist and diabetics would suffer or die from their disease. Despite these benefits, some people believe that animals should not be used for testing medical techniques and drugs. This essay will outline the advantages of animal testing.

Animal testing allows scientists to test and create new drugs. Animals such as monkeys or rabbits have similar physical processes to humans. This allows scientists to test the

effects of certain drugs. If a drug produces adverse effects in animals it is probably unfit for human use.

Animal testing is cheap. There is a large supply of animals for medical research. Animals are easily bred, and maintained safely in controlled labs. The costs of testing in humans would be extremely high.

Many people argue that animal testing is cruel. In some cases this is true. However it would be much more cruel to test new drugs on people or children, or to let people die because there was not enough information about a drug. Furthermore, legislation in most countries sets standards for animal treatment, and laboratories have guidelines to prevent cruelty.

Opponents of animal research also say that information from animals does not apply to humans. They point to certain commercial drugs which have been withdrawn because of side-effects in humans. While it is true that animal systems differ from human systems, there are enough similarities to apply information from animals to humans.

Animal rights campaigners claim that we don't need new tests because we already have vast amounts of information. However, many new deadly infections appear every year and new treatments and drugs are needed to combat these deadly plagues.

Animal testing is needed in the world we live in. Our responsibility is to manage the animals in our care and balance their suffering against the good that comes from them.

321 words

BUILDING

103. It has recently been announced that a new movie theater may be built in your neighborhood.

Do you support or oppose this plan? Why?

Use specific reasons and details to support your answer.

I live in a small community. From my everyday experience and observation I can say that the idea about building a new theatre in my neighborhood has some advantages as well as disadvantages. In this essay I will first focus on the reasons why I support this idea and then move on to analyzing why I oppose it.

First of all, I like movies and my husband and I sometimes go to the movie theatre to watch premieres. Unfortunately, it is time-consuming for us. We have to drive about 50 minutes to the nearest movies theatre. So, the idea of having a movie theatre in our neighborhood seems very attractive. It would save us an hour just to get there and another hour to get back home. Another important aspect of it is that in this case we will be able to get to the movie theatre by foot. I must to confess that we always have parking troubles in the parking space near the movie theatre.

Second of all, new movie theatre is a very good place for students who want to earn some money. My husband and I live near a student community, so I think it would be a great news for them. In addition to this practical benefit students will be able to watch all movies free of charge. I suppose it is a great way to save some money.

Finally, there are usually many restaurants and entertaining centers around a movie theatre. There people can have dinner or play game machines.

In contrast, I think that the building of a new movie theatre will destroy the silence and beauty of out community. Such entertaining centers are often noisy. Moreover, traffic jams will probably be the result of it.

In conclusion, I think that if the question was about building a new movie theatre in the next neighborhood I would completely agree.

(316 words)

104. A company has announced that it wishes to build a large factory near your community.

Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of this new influence on your community.

Do you support or oppose the factory? Explain your position.

I am from Saint-Petersburg, Russia. I believe that building a large factory near my community has advantages as well as disadvantages. In the following paragraphs I will list basic benefits and losses that will be brought by a new factory.

For several reasons, I think that a new factory will not be a good addition to my

neighborhood. First of all, factories often bring pollution. They are prone to contaminating the local air and water. Second of all, factories make noise. Another important aspect of building a new factory near by is that it will make the local traffic heavy. As a result of this, the amount of traffic congestions will increase, as well as contamination of the air. So, all these obviously will not make one's life happier and healthier in my community.

From the other side, I believe that a new factory will bring some advantages to my community. First of all, it will bring new job opportunities. Many specialists will be required to work there. Second of all, I think many local community facilities will have to be renovated to obtain reliable supply of water and electricity. So, some old pipes may be changed. Another important benefit of this is that the local roads in order to manage the increasing traffic will be rebuilt and widened.

However, I do not think that listed above benefits are worth all these troubles including water contamination and the constant pollution of air. From my point of view all factories must be built far from the people communities because they can be really harmful for people's health.

(266 words)

Sample 2:

New factories often bring many good things to a community, such as jobs and increased prosperity. However, in my opinion, the benefits of having a factory are outweighed by the risks. That is why I oppose the plan to build a factory near my community.

I believe that this city would be harmed by a large factory. In particular, a factory would destroy the quality of the air and water in town. Factories bring smog and pollution. In the long run, the environment will be hurt and people's health will be affected. Having a factory is not worth that rise.

Of course, more jobs will be created by the factory. Our population will grow. To accommodate more workers, more homes and stores will be needed. Do we really want this much growth, so fast? If our town is going in growth, I would prefer slow growth with good planning. I don't want to see rows of cheaply constructed townhouses. Our quality of life must be considered.

I believe that this growth will change our city too much. I love my hometown because it is a safe, small town. It is also easy to travel here. If we must expand to hold new citizens, the small-town feel will be gone. I would miss that greatly.

A factory would be helpful in some ways. However, I feel that the dangers are greater than the benefits. I cannot support a plan to build a factory here, and hope that others feel the same way.

(251 words)

105. The government has announced that it plans to build a new university. Some people think that your community would be a good place to locate the university. Compare the advantages and disadvantages of establishing a new university in your community. Use specific details in your discussion.

I think it is a great idea to build a new university in my community. However, I think it is a controversial question whether the building of a new university will bring only benefits to our community. In this essay I will analyze advantages and disadvantages of this issue and present my view in favor of establishing a new university in my community.

From the one side, establishing a new university in my community brings many benefits. First of all, a new construction means more job opportunities. I think it would be good for my community because many people have to spend much time driving to their work day in and day out because they could not find a job in our neighborhood. Second of all, a new university is a good chance to meet new people and I like this opportunity. Many students will live in our community. Finally, if a new university is built in my community there is a big chance that I will be willing to enroll in it. I think it is great because it is not far from my place and I do not have to move to another part of the city. Another important aspect of this is that people from my community will have a chance to use new libraries and facilities of a new university. For example some people can take courses and classes there.

From the other side, building a new university can bring some disadvantages. A new construction means noise, traffic jams and different kinds of pollution. In addition to these disadvantages, many young people in our community can cause more noise especially in the evenings.

To sum up, I think that I would support the decision of the government of establishing a new university in my community despite a few disadvantages that could follow this construction. I believe that a new university will increase a chance of many young people to get a higher education, gain more knowledge and experience, which will help them to succeed in today's world.

(341 words)

106. Should a city try to preserve its old, historic buildings or destroy them and replace them with modern buildings? Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.

Some people think that old, historic buildings are no need for the city and they should be destroyed and replaced with modern ones. However, other people believe that historic buildings must be preserved in order to know and remember our past. For several reasons that I will mention below I agree with those people who want to preserve old, historical buildings.

First of all, by preserving historical buildings we pass our history to our future generations. I think that our children should know their history, learn from it and respect it. People need

to know their traditions and customs, which are priceless and irreplaceable. Our history is our knowledge and power. From my opinion we need to preserve and restore historical buildings. By destroying them we show our disrespect to our forefathers and their traditions.

Second of all, by preserving historical buildings a city can attract many travelers. Welcoming tourists a city can get many benefits including money, which can be spent on preserving historical buildings as well as on improving roads and facilities.

Also, many tourists mean a lot of new business opportunities. Another important aspect of this is that businessmen will be willing to build new recreational centers, hotels, movie theaters, shopping centers to make a city more attractive for travelers. In addition to those practical benefits, many people will have the opportunity to get a job. All this is good for the economy of the city.

To sum up, I believe that preserving old, historical buildings can bring only benefits to a city and all humankind.

(259 words)

107. In the past, buildings often reflected the culture of a society but today all modern buildings look alike and cities throughout the world are becoming more and more similar.

What do you think is the reason for this, and is it a good thing or a bad thing?

City has its architectural character, but the similarities between cities are more obvious these days than in the past. In my opinion, one reason for this is the high price of land.

In most large cities, land is scarce and consequently it is very valuable. This has led to the construction of tall buildings which occupy only a small area of land while providing lots of floor space where people can live or work. Buildings of this type are made of concrete and steel and can be built comparatively quickly using prefabricated materials. They do not use local materials, such as stone, timber or brick, which used to give cities their individual character. In consequence many cities now look very much the same and you might not know whether you were in Brisbane, Bangkok or Berlin when you are on the street.

While I realise that we cannot stand in the way of progress, I believe that cities should try to keep some individuality. For example, in Paris it is prohibited to build very tall buildings in the centre of the city, as this would spoil the overall appearance of the skyline.

Other cities have chosen to design unique buildings to ensure they look different. The twin towers in Kuala Lumpur or the Opera House in Sydney are examples of this approach, and I agree with this kind of initiative.

All in all, although it is regrettable that modern cities look similar, I tend to feel that this is unavoidable. However, it can be argued that, even if the buildings are similar, cities will maintain their own character as a result of cultural diversity, the terrain and the climate, which ultimately determine how people live.

108. In many major cities of the world, you will find large public buildings, both new and old.

Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of such buildings.

How important is it for a country to construct impressive public buildings when houses are what is really required?

(Introduction: mention that public buildings exist in all cities and towns, large and small, e.g. post office, court house, places of worship, theatre)

A public building is a building that belongs in some way to the state. The number of public buildings in any town or village will depend on the size of that community and its needs. For example, you will usually find a town hall of some sort, a school and a place of worship at the least. In larger communities there will be a police station, law courts, a library and maybe a theatre funded by the state.

(Pros: city pride, beautiful to look at, useful/necessary buildings, create a city centre.)

The desire to build impressive buildings is not new. The ancient cities of the Middle East and South America were designed with large public buildings to impress visitors and enemies and give a sense of pride. In modern times, outstanding public buildings still create a great sense of local and national pride. They are what gives a city its character and they form a social centre, a place where people like to meet.

(Cons: waste of public money, intimidating, nationalistic. Give opinion on whether they stop us from building houses or whether they can be compatible.)

However, some people argue that governments have constructed unnecessary, and sometimes ugly, buildings simply to make themselves feel important. I tend to feel that such buildings may be a waste of public money but I am not sure we can claim that they prevent houses from being built, because these governments have often ensured that adequate housing was also available. Houses and public buildings can exist side by side.

(Conclusion - sum up the two parts to the answer. Leave the reader thinking.)

The answer lies in finding a proper right balance. We want to feel pride in our town, but we also want our citizens to have comfortable homes. It is hard to please everyone.

109. In the past, buildings often reflected the culture of a society but today all modern buildings look alike and cities throughout the world are becoming more and more similar.

city has its architectural character, but the similarities between cities are more obvious these days than in the past. In my opinion, one reason for this is the high price of land.

In most large cities, land is scarce and consequently it is very valuable. This has led to the construction of tall buildings which occupy only a small area of land while providing lots of floor space where people can live or work. Buildings of this type are made of concrete and steel and can be built comparatively quickly using prefabricated materials. They do not use local materials, such as stone, timber or brick, which used to give cities their individual character. In consequence many cities now look very much the same and you might not know whether you were in Brisbane, Bangkok or Berlin when you are on the street.

While I realise that we cannot stand in the way of progress, I believe that cities should try

to keep some individuality. For example, in Paris it is prohibited to build very tall buildings in the centre of the city, as this would spoil the overall appearance of the skyline.

Other cities have chosen to design unique buildings to ensure they look different. The twin towers in Kuala Lumpur or the Opera House in Sydney are examples of this approach, and I agree with this kind of initiative.

All in all, although it is regrettable that modern cities look similar, I tend to feel that this is unavoidable. However, it can be argued that, even if the buildings are similar, cities will maintain their own character as a result of cultural diversity, the terrain and the climate, which ultimately determine how people live.

LIFESTYLE

110. Some people enjoy change, and they look forward to new experiences. Others like their lives to stay the same, and they do not change their usual habits. Compare these two approaches to life. Which approach do you prefer? Explain why.

Some people like to live in the same house, have the same job and habits all their lives. However, others aspire to changes and new experience. Personally, for the several reasons, which I will explain bellow, I prefer the first approach to life.

First of all, changes in one's life bring many benefits. One tries new things, gains new knowledge and experience. I think it is great because without changes life becomes boring. I always try to make changes in my life. Moreover, when I feel that my life is boring I do not feel well about it. I feel like I spent those days for nothing. I did not do anything exiting, I learnt nothing interesting and I just waisted my time.

Second of all, people need changes. Furthermore, we need obstacles to overcome and reach our goals. I believe that changes make us stronger, more persistent, more self-confident, and more patient. Also, I feel that all people who succeeded in life like changes and new experience because it is impossible to be the best at some field without perfecting the present knowledge and gain new experience. People catch every opportunity to learn more and change their life for the best.

From the other side, people who like their lives to stay the same are very permanent. They have the same job all their life, the same habits, the same week-ends and even the same years in years out. I think it is boring. What will they tell their children about their lives? What kind of contribution will they make for the society? I think such people are just afraid of changes.

I think curiosity and aspiration to the new experience are two of the main reasons of human evolution. People always wanted to break limits and gain more knowledge and experience. So, people who enjoy change are the engine of human development.

(314 words)

111. Some people prefer to eat at food stands or restaurants. Other people prefer to prepare and eat food at home. Which do you prefer? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Man, through the ages, has undergone any changes from the time when he had to hunt for food to these days when he has to buy it. Some people prefer to buy fresh vegetables, meat and fruits and prepare food at home. However, other people prefer to skip that step with cooking and have dinner at a restaurant. I think that both of these choices have some advantages and disadvantages. Bellow I will give some reasons to support my answer.

Personally, I do not like fast food. So, my choice is always between a restaurant and my home. First of all, I would like to say that cooking is a great tradition. It helps people to relax, reflect on some pleasant moments while peeling or cutting the vegetables. It is a means of eliminating one's stress and tension. Second of all, sometimes I do not want to have something too complicated for my dinner. I just want to have light food like a salad

and a glass of milk. So, one of the reasons why I like to eat at home is because I can have what I want at this moment. One greater thing about eating at home is that I can sit in front of the TV and watch an interesting program or a movie. Finally, having dinner at home allows a family communicates with each other, be closer and share some good and bad moments that happened earlier that day. Besides, eating at home is a great way to save some money.

As for restaurants, I see some positive aspects about eating there too. First of all, I sometimes get tired from peeling, cutting, washing, frying, etc. It does not mean I do it a lot. Sometimes I just use the microwave and a preprocessed food that I bought earlier. I want to have something more delicious than I have in my refrigerator, something that is time-consuming to prepare at home. So, for me it is a good reason to go to a restaurant. There one may meet old friends or just has a great time listening to music and tasting some delicious meats.

Also, restaurants are a good place to celebrate something. One does not have to prepare food for all friends who are coming, wash dish, put in order all that mess after the party, etc.

In conclusion, I think that it does not important where one has one's dinner. What important is that it must be full and nutritious.

112. Fashion trends are difficult to follow these days and it's widely believed that they primarily exist just to sell clothes. Some people believe that we shouldn't follow them and that we should dress in what we like and feel comfortable in. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?.

It's widely believed in today's materialistic world that the latest innovative fashion trends hold great significance. On the other hand, such trends are believed to be set only in the pursuit of profits for large designer companies. It seems that in recent times, people are now changing their minds in regards to wearing clothes for comfort and as a personal choice. Personally I agree that we should pay more attention to individuality and comfort in the way we dress.

Firstly, fashion designs exist as a form of creative artistic expression of the designer. Although this may be true, undoubtedly such designs take away individuality once a trend is set in place. By this I mean that there is nothing unique about wearing what everybody else does. More specifically, if everyone sports the latest colour and design in summer skirts, do we not look the same?

Secondly, It is possible that fashion trends can look extremely stylish to the general public. However, it can be argued that the main purpose of wearing clothes is for more functional reasons. This is primarily due to the fact that clothes were traditionally worn to protect people from climatic conditions. For instance, clothes are still worn basically to keep people warm and dry in winter and cool in summer.

Finally, fashion certainly gives us a sense of confidence and pride in our appearance. While this is certainly a good point, it also means that following such changeable trends proves to be expensive. For example, purchasing every latest season's fashion item will of course blow the budget of many young people.

In conclusion, there are various arguments to support the dismissal of fashion trends, consisting of not conforming, comfort and price, which I strongly agree with.

(290 words)

113. Nowadays, food has become easier to prepare. Has this change improved the way people live?

Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

The twentieth century has brought with it many advances. With those advances, human lives have changed dramatically. In some ways life is worse, but mostly it is better. Changes in food preparation methods, for example, have improved our lives greatly.

The convenience of preparing food today is amazing. Even stoves have gotten too slow for us. Microwave cooking is much easier. We can press a few buttons and a meal is completely cooked in just a short time. People used to spend hours preparing an oven-cooked meal, and now they can use that time for other, better things. Plus, there are all kinds of portable, prepackaged foods we can buy. Heat them in the office microwave, and lunch at work is quick and easy.

Food preparation today allows for more variety. With refrigerators and freezers, we can preserve a lot of different foods in our homes. Since technology makes cooking so much faster, people are willing to make several dishes for even a small meal. Parents are more likely to let children be picky, now that they can easily heat them up some prepackaged macaroni and cheese on the side. Needless to say, adults living in the same house may have very different eating habits as well. If they don't want to cook a lot of different dishes, it's common now to eat out at restaurants several times a week.

Healthful eating is also easier than ever now. When people cook, they use new fat substitutes and cooking sprays to cut fat and calories. This reduces the risk of heart disease and high cholesterol. Additionally, we can buy fruits and vegetable fresh, frozen or canned. They are easy to prepare, so many of us eat more of those nutritious items daily. A hundred years ago, you couldn't imagine the process of taking some frozen fruit and ice from the freezer, adding some low-fat yogurt from a plastic cup and some juice from a can in the refrigerator, and whipping up a low-fat smoothie in the blender!

Our lifestyle is fast, but people still like good food. What new food preparation technology has given us is more choices. Today, we can prepare food that is more convenient, healthier, and of greater variety than ever before in history.

114. Nowadays food has become easier to prepare. Has this change improved the way people live?

Food is a basic part of life, so it follows that improved methods of food preparation have made our lives better. Nowadays we can prepare meals much faster than we could in the past. We can also enjoy a greater variety of food and eat more healthfully, all because of modern methods of food preparation.

Microwave ovens have made it possible to prepare delicious food quickly. People these days rarely have time to shop and prepare meals the old-fashioned way. We live very fast lives. We are busy working, caring for our families travelling, playing sports, and many other things. Because of microwave ovens, we have time to enjoy a good meal with our family and then play soccer, go to a movie, study, or do anything else we want to

afterwards.

Modern methods of preserving food have made it possible to enjoy a wide variety of food. Because of refrigerators, freezers, canning, and freeze-drying, we can eat fruits and vegetables that come from far away places. We can prepare a meal one day and save the leftovers in the refrigerator or freezer to eat at another time. We can keep different kinds of food in the refrigerator or on the shelf. Its easy to always have food available and to be able to eat completely different meals every day.

Healthful eating is easier now than it ever was. Because of modern transportation methods, fresh fruits and vegetables are available all year round. Modern kitchen appliances make it easy to prepare fruits and vegetables fro cooking. Bread machines make it possible to enjoy healthful, home-baked bread whenever we like. We can eat fresh and healthful food everyday because modern methods have made preparation easy.

Our lifestyle is fast, but people still like good food. New food preparation methods have given us is more choices. Today we can prepare food that is more convenient healthier, and of greater variety than ever before in history.

Some people prefer to spend their lives doing the same things and avoiding change. Others, however, think that change is always a good thing.

Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

Over the last half century the pace of change in the life of human beings has increased beyond our wildest expectations. This has been driven by technological and scientific breakthroughs that are changing the whole way we view the world on an almost daily basis. This means that change is not always a personal option, but an inescapable fact of life, and we need to constantly adapt to keep pace with it.

Those people who believe they have achieved some security by doing the same, familiar things are living in denial. Even when people believe they are resisting change themselves, they cannot stop the world around them from changing. Sooner or later they will find that the familiar jobs no longer exist, or that the 'safe' patterns of behaviour are no longer appropriate.

However, reaching the conclusion that change is inevitable is not the same as assuming that 'change is always for the better'. Unfortunately, it is not always the case that new things are promoted because they have good impacts for the majority of people. A lot of innovations are made with the aim of making money for a few. This is because it is the rich and powerful people in our society who are able to impose changes (such as in working conditions or property developments) that are in their own interests.

In conclusion, I would say that change can be stimulating and energising for individuals when they pursue it themselves, but that all change, including that which is imposed on people, does not necessarily have good outcomes.

SPORT

115. Popular events like the football World Cup and other international sporting occasions are essential in easing international tensions and releasing patriotic emotions in a safe way.

Every four years, the whole world stops to watch international sporting events such as the Olympics and the Football World Cup in which athletes show their best performance to make their country proud of them. These sporting occasions have proved to be helpful in easing international tensions in difficult times when powerful leaders were trying to control the world's economy and other governments were fighting over land.

The Olympic Games are one of the best examples which prove how sporting events can bring nations together, at least temporarily. From ancient History, when Greeks and Romans would interrupt battles to participate in the games, to the more recent international disputes, when athletes from Palestine and Israel would forget their differences, compete pacifically and even embrace each other after an event. Moreover, these popular events have called the world's attention to the terrible consequences of wars; thus some leaders have tried to accept agreements to end their dispute and live peacefully.

Similarly, international sporting events show benefits in some developing countries which live in a daily internal civil war. For example, Brazil has a high rate of unemployment, lack of education, hunger, crime, poverty and corruption which leads to an immense embarrassment of being Brazilian and a low self-esteem. However, when the Football World Cup starts, the Brazilian squad, which is considered the best team in the world, provokes an amazing feeling of pride in their country. Most people seem to forget all their problems and even the criminal activity decreases. They paint roads with the national colors, use wear the Brazilian team shirt and buy national flags. Moreover, the competition brings families and neighbors together and even rival gangs watch the games and celebrate peacefully.

In conclusion, popular sporting events play an important role in decreasing international tensions and liberating patriotic feelings as History has shown.

This is a great essay, the ideas, language, structure of paragraphs and sentences, grammar show high level of English. In my opinion it is Band 8. Keep up the good work.

115. Should dangerous sports be banned? Yes!

Millions of people play sport every day, and, inevitably, some suffer injury or pain. Most players and spectators accept this risk. However, some people would like to see dangerous sports such as boxing banned. This essay will examine some of the reasons for banning certain sports.

Some sports are nothing but an excuse for violence. Boxing is a perfect example. The last thing an increasingly violent world needs is more violence on our television. The sight of two men (or even women) bleeding, with faces ripped open, trying to obliterate each other

is barbaric. Other sports, such as American football or rugby, are also barely-concealed violence.

Some people argue that the players can choose to participate. However this is not always the case. Many boxers, for example, come from disadvantaged backgrounds. They are lured by money or by social or peer pressure and then cannot escape. Even in richer social groups, schools force unwilling students to play aggressive team sports, claiming that playing will improve the students' character (or the school's reputation), but in fact increasing the risk of injury.

Even where people can choose, they sometimes need to be protected against themselves. Most people approve of governments' efforts to reduce smoking. In the same way, governments need to act if there are unacceptably high levels of injuries in sports such as football, diving, mountaineering, or motor-racing.

I accept that all sports involve challenge and risk. However violence and aggression should not be permitted in the name of sport. Governments and individuals must act to limit brutality and violence, so that children and adults can enjoy and benefit from sport.

272 words

116. Save our Sports!

Today, many sports are becoming increasingly regulated. Boxing, rugby, soccer, and other games are being targeted by sports bodies and medical organizations in an effort to improve safety standards and to reduce injuries. However, for some people, this is not enough, and they would rather see some dangerous sports banned completely. In this essay, I will examine some arguments against banning dangerous sports.

Sports, competition, and games seem to be natural to humans. Young children learn their own limits and strengths through play with others, but they also learn valuable social lessons about what acceptable behavior and the rights of others. Sport therefore is not just a physical phenomenon, but a mental and social one.

Challenging sport provides a healthy, largely safe, physical outlet for aggression. There is very little evidence to show that people who take part in dangerous sports become violent as a result. In fact it is more likely that apart from the many friendships created in playing, sport acts as a safety valve for a society by reducing stress. Moreover, sport teaches and requires discipline, training, and respect for the rules - valuable lessons in any society.

Almost all sports involve some risk. Young rugby players are paralysed every year in scrums. Scuba-diving accidents can lead to brain damage or death. Even golf or jogging can lead to pain or injury. Without some elements of risk or challenge, sport becomes meaningless. A marathon runner trying to improve his time, basketball players fiercely battling an opposing team, or a sky-diving team defying gravity - all are trying to push themselves to their maximum. There is therefore no sport without danger.

There is also the issue of freedom. Without a wide range of sports, many people would feel trapped or limited. People should be free to participate in activities with others as long as it does not affect the safety of non-participants.

There also should be limits to the power of governments to ban sports. If one sport is banned because of alleged danger, then what sport would be next? Boxing is the most common target of opponents of dangerous sports. But if boxing is banned, would motor racing follow, then rugby, wrestling, or weightlifting? Furthermore, many sports would go underground, leading to increased injury and illegal gambling.

Nobody denies that regulation is needed. Medical bodies have introduced safety rules in boxing, in soccer, and these safety regulations have been welcomed by players. But the role of government should be reduced.

In conclusion, our society would be healthier if more people took part in sports of all kinds. We should continue to try to prevent accidents and injuries. However, we should also ensure that sports are challenging, exciting, and, above all, fun.

(454 words)

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

117. What discovery in the last 100 years has been most beneficial for people in your country?

Use specific reasons and examples to support your choice.

I am from Russia. From my opinion the most beneficial discovery for people in our country has been the discovery of the outer space. Russia is the first country that launched a spacecraft with a man on the board into the space. This event was a big step towards the new discoveries and brought many benefits not only for people in my country. Bellow I will give my reasons to support my answer.

First of all, all humankind made a huge step towards the mystery of our creation. Scientists had the opportunity to do the new research and experiments. Many new discoveries were made on the boards of the spacecrafts in the outer space. People from all over the world watched these events. Many books with real colorful photos were written about the beginning of the space exploration. Nowadays we have a big station called "Mir" in the outer space created on the base of collaboration USA and Russia. Many people work there doing amazing experiments.

Second of all, the world became "smaller". People learnt how to exchange information very quickly by use of satellites. Television is broad-casted all over the world by use of satellites. Here in Houston I can watch Russian programs. People got the opportunity to exchange news very quickly.

To sum up, I believe that space exploration will bring much more benefits in the future and someday we will learn what is beyond our current galaxy.

(240 words)

118. The 21st century has begun. What changes do you think this new century will bring?

Use examples and details in your answer.

Man, through the ages, has undergone many changes from the time when he depicted a herd of mammoths on the walls of his cave to these days when he can create beautiful pictures and even make coffee by use of computer technologies without leaving his favorite chair. The 20th century made huge steps in developing computer technologies and reached many goals that made our life much easier. What should we expect in the 21st century?

First of all, I think that the pace of our life will speed up: we will move faster from one place to another, from one continent to another using high speed jet airplanes. Second of all, I believe that we will be able to do many things that take much time now without leaving our house. Computers will be everywhere including out clothes. Many people will have chips and mini computers inserted in their heads to hold huge amount of information and have a quick access to it.

But what will be the most amazing thing in the 21st century is the flights to the outer space and Mars that will be available to all people. Scientists say that Mars has many things similar to the Earth's. Moreover, they say that with the help of modern technology people can artificially create conditions that will allow people to live there on the constant basis.

To sum up, I am sure that many amazing changes will be brought by the 21st century. Furthermore, I think that with the help of the contemporary technologies people can do many things that were even difficult to imagine a century ago. So, nowadays it is rather difficult and even impossible to imagine all changes that will happen in the next decades.

(290 words)

119. It has been more than 30 years since man first landed on the moon. Some people think that space research is a waste of money. Discuss.

For over fifty years, a number of nations have been involved in the exploration of outer space. This research has been very costly, of course. Has this money been well-spent or wasted?

Some people believe that all or most space research should be eliminated because of its incredible expense, not only in terms of money, but also in terms of scientific and human resources. These people point out the fact that it cost billions of dollars to send astronauts to the moon, but all they brought back were some worthless rocks. These people say that the money and effort now being wasted in outer space could be spent for homeless people, improving the education system, saving the environment, and finding cures for diseases.

However, other people believe that space research has provided many benefits to mankind. They point out that hundreds of useful products, from personal computers to heart pacemakers to freeze-dried foods, are the direct or indirect results of space research. They say that weather and communication satellites, which are also products of space programs, have benefited people all over the globe. In addition to these practical benefits, supporters of the space program point to the scientific knowledge that has been acquired about the sun, the moon, the planets and even our own earth as a result of space research.

I agree with those people who support space research and want it to continue. Space research, as shown, has already brought many benefits to humanity. Perhaps it will bring even more benefits in the future, ones that we can not even imagine now. Moreover, just as individual people need challenges to make their lives more interesting, I believe the human race itself needs a challenge, and I think that the peaceful exploration of outer space provides just such a challenge.

TRAVEL

120. According to those in the travel business, the nature of the average 'holiday' is changing. Rather than seeking a relaxing break in a far-away place, people now want excitement on their holidays and are keen to participate in unusual and challenging activities.

Do you agree or disagree?

Holidays are important because they provide a break from our normal daily routine and from the world of work. Traditionally, holidays have been seen as a time for relaxation and as an opportunity to visit another country in order to find out about its geography and customs. Nowadays, however, it seems that other types of holiday are becoming popular.

Some people want their holiday to be a kind of adventure, and find this more exciting than going to the beach or visiting museums. On an adventure holiday, you may stay in quite basic accommodation, rather than a luxurious hotel. Activities may involve things such as bush walking or cycling, or may form part of an aid project designed to help communities in remote areas. Holidays such as these are popular with people of all ages and can often help to promote tourism in rural environments.

The increasing popularity of dangerous sports has also boosted the number of adventure holidays; for example, water sports, mountain climbing or paragliding. These holidays are more popular with the younger generation, as they can be both physically and mentally demanding. Participants are often seeking the sort of thrills that they cannot get in ordinary life.

There is now greater awareness of the damaging effects of mass tourism and this may be one reason for the changing nature of holidays. This can only be a good thing. But perhaps people are also discovering that it is just as refreshing to take an active holiday, as it is to lie on a beach - though that is still a question of personal preference.

(266 words)

121. You have the opportunity to visit a foreign country for two weeks.

Which country would you like to visit?

Use specific reasons and details to explain your choice.

I am a person who likes to travel. I think traveling is a great opportunity to meet new people, gain more knowledge and experience, and learn new customs and traditions. I did not travel a lot yet, but I am sure I will have a chance to do it. So, if I had the opportunity to visit a foreign country I would visit Egypt. I think it is a great and very interesting country with marvellous history. In the following paragraphs I will give some reasons to support my choice.

First of all, I always dreamed to visit Egypt pyramids. My aunt visited Egypt a few years ago. She was very excited after that trip and said that she would return there one more time at any cost. She said that Egypt had impressed her very much with its glorious pyramids and ancient buildings. Second of all, I think that in that country one can touch

history, feel the hard breath of workers building a pyramid under the parching sun, and see the chain of camels walking in the desert with the huge trunks full of presents for Cleopatra on their humps. Finally, I want to see a real dessert and ride the camel. All my friends who rode the camel say that it is an unforgettable experience.

I believe that I will have a chance to visit this beautiful country someday. Unfortunately, now I have plenty of plans and things to do, so, I am afraid that I will not be able to travel for the next two years. I want to finish my education and then find a job, and these things have higher priority than traveling. My husband wants to visit this country too and we made an agreement to make our trip to Egypt on our five years anniversary which is in two years.

In conclusion, I want to add that after my trip to Egypt I will definitely visit Australia. This country is the second one on my list the most wanted to see.

(339 words)

122. Nowadays, international tourism is the biggest industry in the world. Unfortunately, international tourism creates tension rather than understanding between people from different cultures. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

The growth of tourism and the numbers of people travelling to other countries for their vacations has led to debate as to whether this is beneficial. I believe that there are many problems which arise out of the tourist industry, and will examine these in detail.

Many people argue that travel broadens the mind. However, this statement does not fully hold water. I would argue that spending a few weeks in another country is not long enough to gain a proper understanding of an alien culture. A foreigner visiting Britain might be met with the traditional British reserve, and mistakenly conclude that the British are unfriendly. Furthermore, some people are unwilling to open their minds. A Western traveller to an Arab country is unlikely to consider that the veiling of women is acceptable.

Being a tourist in a foreign country brings with it problems that can lead to dislike of the native people. Firstly, a foreigner is vulnerable, and is often ripped off by locals. Secondly, the language barrier can lead to misunderstandings. Thirdly, tourists are often hassled to buy goods, which can ruin a holiday. When I went to Bali, people tried to sell me something every five minutes, and this totally spoilt my sunbathing.

Local people also often end up disliking foreigners. Visitors may mistakenly act contrary to local norms, or they may just be plain offensive, as many drunken British holidaymakers must seem to the Spanish. Global tourism can lead to hostility from the native people, who may feel their traditional way of life is under threat. Additionally, the relative wealth of the foreign visitors can cause envy and resentment.

In conclusion, I would say that I largely agree with the argument that global tourism creates misunderstanding between people from different cultures, and that the differences are often a cause for conflict rather than celebration.

JOB

123. Some people prefer to work for a large company. Others prefer to work for a small company. Which would you prefer? Use specific reasons and examples to support your choice.

The issue whether working for a large company is better than working for a small company is a controversial one. From my everyday experience and observation I think that every option has its advantages and disadvantages. I base my opinion on the following points.

From the one side working for a large company brings many benefits. First of all, one has better medical insurance, higher salary. Often employees of a large company have less responsibility. Moreover, they feel more secure because their company has more clients and this means better chance to survive on the modern market. However, one working for a large company has less chance to be promoted because one's manager does not want to lose his or her job unless she or he is promoted too. Also, from my observation, managers of a large company do not pay much attention to one's solutions and suggestions.

From the other side working for a small company has many advantages too. Firstly, one has better chance to be promoted. Secondly, one can talk to the owner of the company about any improvements that can be done in order to get more profit. Another important aspect of working for a small company is the opportunities to find out more about how company works. As a result of this one can gain more experience and get better recommendations. However, this also has some disadvantages. For instance, one can get less salary, worse medical benefits, etc.

To sum up, I think that every person chooses for himself what he or she wants. If one wants better career and more responsibilities then a small company is better choice. Otherwise, working for a large company may be a good option too. (286 words)

124. We all work or will work in our jobs with many different kinds of people. In your opinion, what are some important characteristics of a co-worker (someone you work closely with)? Use reasons and specific examples to explain why these characteristics are important.

A large number of people spend most of their time at work. Our life is divided into three equal parts: 8 hours - sleep, 8 hours - work, 8 hours - family time. So, in the most cases, one's co-worker plays an important role in one's life. From my opinion, the essential characteristics of a co-worker are the following.

First of all, a person who works closely with me must like his job. I think it is very important for a person to feel satisfaction with his job. My husband is a software developer. He is fond of his job and people enjoy working with him because they see how many energy he puts into his job.

Second of all, my co-worker must be persistent and never give up. I like when people who came across a problem try to solve it, find a good decision instead of looking for another

person to hand it over. Another important aspect of this is that a good worker should always ask himself "What can be improved?" and suggests new solutions.

In addition, he must be a good team player. In the modern world good communication skills and the ability to work in a team are among the common position requirements. Personally, I think it is great to help each other, share new ideas, develop new solutions, etc. It helps to create a team spirit and improve labor productivity.

Finally, my co-worker must be punctual. He or she should finish the job on time I think that It is unacceptable to make the rest of a team wait while a person finishes his or her job. Also, my "ideal co-worker" should always be ready to offer his or her help and be supportive.

To summarize, I think if a co-worker possesses all of these qualities mentioned above he can make work with him really enjoyable and productive.

(314 words)

| |
|---|
| <p>125. What are some important qualities of a good supervisor (boss)? Use specific details and examples to explain why these qualities are important.</p> |
|---|

Many people have to work under somebody's supervision. In most cases an employee does not choose his or her boss, unless a supervisor is elected. In the following paragraphs I will list the most important qualities of my "ideal boss".

First of all, he must be impartial. I believe that it is very important to make a technical decision, think about somebody's promotion, etc. impartially. For instance, my friend is a supervisor on a dairy mill. It is his family's business so a lot of his relatives work there. But he never promotes someone because he or she is his family. I think it is a good quality for a boss.

Second of all, my "ideal boss" must be honest, patient and attentive. He should pay attention to people's feelings, encourage them by increasing their salary, listen to their suggestions about improving labor conditions and productivity. For instance, if he does not satisfied with the result he should understand the origin of the problem and explain people how to fix it. In addition, he must know how to solve conflicts that can arise between employees.

Another important quality of a boss is the ability to choose the right decisions and to learn on somebody's mistakes.

Finally, I think a good boss must value his or her employees because the profit directly depends on the people who work there.

In conclusion, I think a good boss should be able to make his people enjoy the work they are doing and encourage their diligence. (252 words)

126. Businesses should hire employees for their entire lives.

Do you agree or disagree?

Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

I would have to completely disagree with the statement above. In the following paragraphs I will outline the basic concepts of my position.

First of all, I will list the major disadvantages for employers. On the today's market a company must be very flexible in order to compete with other firms. So, imagine the situation when a company can not fire its employees to stay on the market. It will lead to losing not only a profit, but the clients, market share and competitive ability. Now, imagine the situation when a company is growing fast, everything is good and the next few years are going to be excellent. So, employers need more people to extend the production. However, nobody can tell what will happen in a few years. In this case, employers will be afraid to hire new people and extend their business because they will not be able to fire them if something goes wrong. Another important aspect of this is that a company can not have the best employees. It can not hire the better one without dismissing another employee.

What kind of disadvantages will have an employee in exchange for this kind of job security? First of all, it will be very difficult to find a job if one is not the best, because an employer does not want to spend money on one's education. Besides, employer will not have a chance to fire one if he does not do his job well. Second of all, employees with this kind of security tend not to perfect themselves because after they are hired they can not lose their job.

In conclusion, I would like to add that this statement has some positive aspects too such as constancy, a strong spirit of the company, etc. This system takes place in Japan and some companies succeeded in it. But I think that the reason of it subsists in the Japanese traditions, the particular cultural features, habits and customs. However, on today's market here in the United States a company can not afford to hire employees for their entire life.

(349 words)

127. Some people like to do only what they already do well.

Other people prefer to try new things and take risks. Which do you prefer?

Use specific reasons and examples to support your choice.

From my everyday experience and observation I think that all people who succeeded in life had to work hard and gain more knowledge and experience in order to reach their goals. From the other hand, people who all their life do things they already do well and do not improve their knowledge do not move forward. I base my statement on the following points.

First of all, people who want to succeed must constantly improve their knowledge and gain more experience. Moreover, they must be the best at their profession. So, they need to try new things, take risks sometimes and work hard.

Second of all, it is impossible to live without trying new things. Imagine one wants to learn how to drive. He will never be able to do it without learning new things such as driving

rules.

Personally, I think that it is very interesting to learn new, to gain more experience, to make new goals and reach them. Life is too short to stay on one place. People need changes because they make our lives more beautiful and exiting. We find out new things, learn new things and dream to know other things. People need challenges because while overcoming obstacles we make new discoveries, become stronger, perfect ourselves and move forward.

To sum up, I believe that people's aspiration for learning new things is the main reason the way we live now. People make many discoveries and inventions that make our lives easier, happier and longer.

(249 words)

128. Companies should encourage employees who work in a high position to leave at the age of 55 in order to give opportunities to the new generation.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

I totally disagree with the idea of high-level employees leaving at the age of 55 to make room for the upcoming generation. While it is true that the energy level and fresh ideas of youth can rejuvenate a company, the steady hand of experience can still best guide a company in most cases.

In English there is a saying, "You can't teach an old dog new tricks." In the fast-paced world of business, bolstered by even faster hi-tech innovations, a younger more pliant mind would seem to be able to adapt with greater flexibility, while such an environment might boggle an older more set-in-its-ways mind. Take, for example, Microsoft's Bill Gates, whose energy and brilliant insights as a youth helped him to pioneer new territory in the computer software world and establish a digital empire. Now as a more mature CEO, this king of the "computer" mountain is constantly on the verge of being knocked down by upcoming digeratti entrepreneurs. However, it is now the experience he has accumulated as an older man which keeps him on top. So, combining the vigour and innovation of younger workers with the experience of older workers would seem to be the winning hand in the world of business.

The assertion is to give opportunities to the younger generation. If everyone retires at 55, there will be smaller pool of experience at the company. So, who will show them the ropes of the trade? It would be as if we lopped off the last few chapters of a textbook. On this point the argument would seem to be built on false presumptions.

And think of all the other problems retirement at 55 would create. With life expectancy in many advanced nations at 70-plus years, how would the state along with private enterprises be able to support their retirement pensions? The economic repercussions of such an idea could be great.

Besides, the Western form of capitalism is built on competition and merit and not seniority according to age, and democracy is built on equality for all regardless of one's age, so the argument clearly goes against these two pillars of Western society.

Granted, my counter-arguments are perhaps as simplistic as the original assertion itself, but without qualifying the assertion with greater supporting evidence or background information, both sides can be argued. Nevertheless, even after thoroughly considering the argument, I believe I would still adhere to my viewpoint that the assertion lacks merit for the aforementioned reasons. Besides, when I am 55 I do not fancy the idea of being put out to pasture. I think I will still be full of vitality and have a desire to work, so I hope my workplace will view me as a treasure house of valuable experience to pass along to the next generation and keep me on until I am at least 65 if not older.

(478 words)

129. In some countries the average worker is obliged to retire at the age of 50, while in others people can work until they are 65 or 70. Meanwhile, we see some politicians enjoying power well into their eighties. Clearly, there is little agreement on an appropriate retirement age. Until what age do you think people should be encouraged to remain in paid employment?

Mandatory retirement age varies from society to society, perhaps a reflection of economics, population pressures or simply value systems. Indeed, retirement at 50 can probably be as easily justified as that at 70. It is my belief, however, that the longer an able person is allowed to work, the better for both the individual worker and the employer.

Chronological age is not always a true indicator of ability. While some 65+ year-olds may not perform as well as they did in their past, many workers at this age do just as well or better than they used to. People's suitability for a position should be a reflection of their performance in the job, rather than the number of wrinkles or grey hairs they have. Employers concerned about the increasing age of their employees need only observe their work records. Those doing poorly may be asked to retire, but those as yet unaffected by age should stay on. Indeed, it would appear economical for an organisation to retain its older employees when possible rather than spend time and money on training new workers.

Remaining in one's job for as long as one is able makes sense as life expectancies increase around the world. As people live longer, they are longer able to contribute to society in the form of meaningful work. But they are also in need of income for a longer period, so a mandatory retirement age of 55 for someone who is statistically likely to live to 77 becomes increasingly difficult to justify. At a time when populations are ageing, governments are less able to provide for their senior citizens, so by keeping able workers in paid employment for as long as is practicable, public expenditures are less strained.

Thus, workers who can still demonstrate their capacity to carry out their work should not be asked to retire simply because they have reached a certain age. Societies that insist on early retirement may do well to look again at their policies.

130. When should people be made to retire? 55? 65? Should there be a compulsory retirement age?

Many old people work well into their 70s and 80s, running families, countries or corporations. Other people, however, despite being fit and highly talented, are forced to retire in their or even earlier because of company or national regulations. This essay will examine whether people should be allowed to continue working for as long as they want or whether they should be encouraged to retire at a particular stage.

There are several arguments for allowing older people to continue working as long as they are able. First of all, older employees have an immense amount of knowledge and experience which can be lost to a business or organization if they are made to retire. A second point is that older employees are often extremely loyal employees and are more willing to implement company policies than younger less committed staff. However, a more important point is regarding the attitudes in society to old people. To force someone to resign or retire at 60 or 65 indicates that the society does not value the input of these people and that effectively their useful life is over.

Allowing older people to work indefinitely however is not always a good policy. Age alone is no guarantee of ability. Many younger employees have more experience or skills than older staff, who may have been stuck in one area or unit for most of their working lives. Having compulsory retirement allows new ideas in an organization. In addition, without age limits, however arbitrary, many people would continue to work purely because they did not have any other plans or roles. A third point of view is that older people should be rewarded by society for their life's labor by being given generous pensions and the freedom to enjoy their leisure.

With many young people unemployed or frustrated in low-level positions, there are often calls to compulsorily retire older workers. However, this can affect the older individual's freedom - and right - to work and can deprive society of valuable experience and insights. I feel that giving workers more flexibility and choice over their retirement age will benefit society and the individual.

131. Some people insist that senior workers 65 or over should retire but others believe that they should continue working. What is your opinion?

Over the past few decades [In the past], there have been many advances in medical technology. Because of this, senior citizens are healthier and more active than before and may choose to work beyond the age of 65. Nowadays, however, there has been a growing debate as to whether or not these people should retire in order to create jobs for the younger generation. Despite the advantages of early retirement, I strongly believe that it is better for senior workers to continue working as long as they are physically and mentally capable.

Those who believe that senior workers need to retire for younger generation base their case on the following arguments. First, the unemployment rate, especially for college graduates, has never been so high so it is today. This is largely due to the slow economy. Therefore, firing some elderly workers who are well-paid would allow those unemployed young people to have good opportunities to get a job. In addition, replacing older workers

with young people would bring greater benefits to companies [=employers]. This is because youngsters are better at adapting themselves to fast changing information based society. They are generally better at computers and speaking foreign languages than their older counterparts.

Nevertheless, people should not ignore the fact that senior citizens have been playing vital roles both at home and at work for their entire lives. To begin with, a young person's need for a job is no more important than an older person's. Both have a responsibility to support their families. Sadly, few seniors can afford early retirement. Besides, senior workers provide the wisdom and experience that young employees cannot offer. There is strong [=acute] possibility of situations arising that require the knowledge of skilled senior employees.

In summary, the advantages of keeping seasoned workers far outweigh its disadvantages. There are high hopes that employers exercise wisdom [=caution] in dealing with this issue.

132. International entertainers, including sports personalities, often get paid millions of dollars in one year. In your view, with widespread poverty in the world, are these huge earnings justified?

The salaries of many singers, dancers and sports people have increased out of all proportion in recent years, while in places like Sudan people are starving to death. I do not believe that anyone should be able to earn such enormous salaries when so many people in the world are living in poverty.

One of the factors which should affect what a person can earn ought to be the benefit of person's work to society. It is unreasonable for a famous singer to be able to earn far more from an evening's entertainment than, for instance, a medical scientist who develops a new drug which produces a treatment for a common disease. The pop star certainly has a value in society, but the value in no way exceeds, or even matches, the value gained from a successful medication.

Secondly, work done should be paid according to the amount of effort and skill that goes into it. Nobody would deny that a famous person works hard and is skillful, yet such people do not work any harder than thousand of other workers who have no claim to fame. Yet market force are such that these superstars can obtain millions of dollars while other unknown people sometimes earn less than they need to survive.

Finally, it should be possible for governments to work together to ensure that the amount of money in circulation should be more more equally and fairly distributed. This seems only fair given that there are so many suffering.

To conclude, it is clear that world poverty is a serious problem and yet the problem could be eased if governments and companies gave more thought to paying salaries on a more equitable basis and if they started to contribute more money to those in need.

133. Many people think that nowadays people are being subjected to more and more pressure in their work, and thus are having less and less time to relax. What is your opinion?

In modern society, especially in big cities, undoubtedly hard work has become a very important feature of ordinary people's everyday life. It seems that many people are under the impression that their work is becoming more pressing and urgent, and thus they sacrifice more and more leisure time.

In the first place, with the rapid development of science and technology, work today is more demanding than it used to be. For example, college graduates nowadays have to master English, computer science and driving skills before they can find decent jobs. People have to spend more time acquiring new techniques and skills. And their spare time tends to be fully occupied, not with leisure pursuit, but with work-related pursuits.

In the second place, competition is becoming more intense. Many people feel anxious that they may be "laid-off" if they can't work as hard as others. And they also feel at a disadvantage before new graduates. Therefore, it is understandable that people keep themselves involved in intensely hard work in order to preserve their positions.

In my opinion, the worst aspect of this phenomenon is that the huge pressure of work will gradually affect people's mental health. Excessively hard work means that people can never get rid of the fatigue of their work, even in their leisure time. This means that they can not enjoy a normal life.

In a word, in modern society overwork is stealing our leisure time. however, I believe this problem will be settled eventually with the development of science and technology.

134. People have different job expectations for jobs. Some people prefer to do the same job for the same company, whereas others prefer to change jobs frequently. Write about the advantages and disadvantages of each viewpoint?

In the modern workplace there is no longer the attitude that 'a job is for life'. Nowadays, many people take the option to change jobs, while others prefer not to. In my essay, I will explore the good and bad points of the above attitudes.

One of the main benefits of staying in one job is security. Changing employer often means a period of instability, where one may have to think about moving house, or temporarily losing a steady source of income. Staying in one job means these problems are avoided.

Another benefit of not changing occupation is that one is able to gain a lot of experience and expertise in his specific profession, thus enhancing job security. One's company may recognize their loyalty and reward their service. On the other hand, those who often change jobs may be seen as unreliable, lacking in experience and employers might be reluctant to hire and invest training in them.

However, there are arguments in favour of changing job frequently. One is that a worker improves his employability. Working in several different jobs often means that the individual has more skills. Such people are seen as more dynamic and versatile.

Another benefit of changing jobs frequently is that one never gets stuck in a rut. From my own experience, I got bored when I spent too long in a job. Following this, the quality of my work would suffer. I also believe that employers generally don't tend to greatly reward loyalty or commitment. Increased wages and promotion are often easier to attain by changing jobs.

Overall, it can be said that the disadvantages of changing jobs are the advantages of staying put, and vice versa... In my opinion, I feel that changing jobs every once in a while is of more benefit.

GOVERNMENT

135. Families who do not send their children to government-financed schools should not be required to pay taxes that support universal education. (AGREE)

Families who do not send their children to government-financed school should not be required to pay taxes that support universal education.

When families send their children to non-public (that is, parochial and private) schools, they must pay tuition and other school expenses. Spending additional money to pay taxes creates an even greater financial hardship for these families. They must make sacrifices, trying to have enough money to pay for school in addition to other bills. For example, my friend Amalia is a single mother with an eight-year-old son, Andrew. Because they survive solely on her income, money is tight. Amalia works at least 10 hours of overtime each week to cover Andrew's school expenses. This gives Amalia and Andrew less time to spend together, and she is always so tired that she is impatient with him when they do have family time. Clearly, this extra expense is an unfair burden for hard-working parents like Amalia.

While some people may consider parochial or private school to be a luxury, for many families it is essential because their community's public schools fail to meet their children's needs. Unfortunately, due to shrinking budgets, many schools lack well-qualified, experienced educators. Children may be taught by someone who is not a certified teacher or who knows little about the subject matter. Some problems are even more serious. For example, the public high school in my old neighborhood/neighbourhood had serious safety problems, due to students bringing guns, drugs, and alcohol to school. After a gang-related shooting occurred at the high school, my parents felt that they had no choice but to enroll me in a parochial school that was known for being very safe.

Unfortunately, even when families prefer public schools, sometimes they can't send their children to one. These families are burdened not only for paying expenses at another school, but also by being forced to pay taxes to support a public school that they do not use.

(323 words)

136. Families who do not send their children to government-financed schools should not be required to pay taxes that support universal education. (DISAGREE)

Families who do not send their children to public school should be required to pay taxes that support public education.

Every child in my country is required to attend school and every child is welcome to enroll at his/her local public school. Some families choose to send their children to other schools, and it is their prerogative to do so. However, the public schools are used by the majority of our children and must remain open for everyone. For example, my uncle sent his two children to a private academy for primary school. Then he lost a huge amount of money through some poor investments and he could no longer afford the private school's

tuition. The children easily transferred to their local public school and liked it even more than their academy. The public schools supported their family when they had no money to educate their children.

Because the public schools educate so many citizens, everyone in my country-whether a parent or not-should pay taxes to support our educational system. We all benefit from the education that students receive in public school. Our future doctors, fire fighters, and teachers-people whom we rely on everyday-are educated in local public schools. When a person is in trouble, it's reassuring to know that those who will help you-such as fire fighters-know what they're doing because they received good training in school and later. Providing an excellent education in the public school system is vital to the strength of our community and our country.

Our government must offer the best education available, but it can only do so with the financial assistance of all its citizens. Therefore, everyone-including families who do not send their children to public school-should support public education by paying taxes. (290 words)

137. Some people say the government should not put money into building theatres and sports stadiums; they should spend more money on medical care and education.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

What would the world be like without Shakespeare or the Olympics? While medical care and education are perhaps the highest causes to which money can be contributed, the arts and athletics are in some ways just as valuable. So, to ask the government to not extend support to these two areas could be just as detrimental to the welfare of society as the lack of sufficient health care and education.

The Romans believed in "mens sana in corpore sano". In short, that there is indeed a correlation between a healthy body and healthy mind. When we are healthy, we feel better and so are more likely to be productive academically. Plus, the practice of sports can also teach us the very same discipline we need for our studies. Why even a brisk walk or watching an exciting athletic match can refresh the mind for greater work. Moreover, sports can serve to create healthier bodies, which in turn would serve as a form of "preventive medicine" thereby cutting down on medical costs. In the same vein, the arts are known to induce a sense of well-being in performers and audience alike, reducing mental problems and their associated physical manifestations and again, medical costs. As such, building theatres and stadiums, which spur interest in the arts and sports respectively, actually would be practically identical to spending money on medical care and education!

Now I realize the question specifically addresses the building of theatres and sports stadiums by government. Some people would contend athletics and the arts can still be enjoyed and practiced without such constructions. I would hazard that these buildings stand as the altars to the sports and arts worlds, inspiring would-be athletes and performers. Without such venues where would sports spectators and music aficionados be able to enjoy these events? Now some other people would also say business could support their construction, but we know the avarice of business could very likely

jeopardize the lofty spirit of athletics and the arts just as well. Therefore, allowing government to retain some say in the matter on behalf of the people would, I believe, be in the best interest of the people.

In short, as long as the government does not go overboard in its expenditures for these buildings and uses such venues for the benefit of all, then, as mentioned above, people will benefit in terms of both medical care and education as well. This is not to say the government should neglect medical care and education, but rather to think of this not as an either-or choice but as a win-win situation for all.

(434 words)

138. The costs of medical health care are increasing all the time. Governments are finding it difficult to balance the health care budget.

Should citizens be totally responsible for their own health costs and take out private health insurance, or is it better to have a comprehensive health care system which provides free health services for all? Discuss.

A much debated issue these days is whether citizens should take out private health insurance or not. The cost of providing free medical care for both the wealthy and the poor is far too great for any government, and most people agree that if you can pay for insurance, you should. In this essay, I will argue that all who can afford it should be insured, but free medical care must be made available for those too poor to do so.

The most important reason for encouraging people to take out private health insurance is the cost to the government of health care. Free health cover for people who are able to pay for it is a waste of public money. Of course, people will only pay health insurance premiums if they know that they are getting good value for their money. If they get sick, they should pay very little or nothing at all. In addition, the privately insured are entitled to special benefits such as having the choice of their own doctors, and being able to avoid long waiting lists for hospital beds.

On the other hand, those who really cannot afford to pay private insurance premiums, which are often very high, are still entitled as citizens to the best medical care available – they cannot be expected to pay their own medical bills. However, if they are working, they should still pay a percentage of their wage (say 1 to 2%) as a tax which pays towards the cost of providing "free" medical services.

In conclusion, most people should privately insure their health, but it is unreasonable to suppose that all citizens can afford it. Therefore, a safety net in the form of a basic free health care system must exist for the very poor and the unemployed.

(300 words)

139. All education, primary, secondary and further education, should be free to all people and paid for by the government.
Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

Different countries have different education systems. I don't know all the education systems in the world but all the ones I do know about have free school education at primary and secondary level. I certainly agree with the statement that this should be the case. I believe university education is different.

No matter what standard of income someone has or what society someone comes from, everyone should have the opportunity to have a good standard of education. This is not always what happens but it is what should happen. Private schools can be available for those who want and can afford it but the free schools should always be there. This is certainly one of the best attributes of western democracy and all countries it seems strive to attain situation although some have problems due to the economic and political situations in their countries. Governments should make sure that all their citizens have access to a good standard of free education at primary and secondary level.

Further education is different. In an ideal world this should be free but governments have a lot of demands on their money. I think that students should have to pay, maybe not all, but at least a contribution towards their tuition fees. They will be able to earn it back once they have graduated. The UK has this system whereas in the US students have to pay all their high tuition fees which can run into the tens of thousands of dollars over a full course. I am not sure if I agree with this but it certainly would make sure that students make the best of efforts to pass or all their money would be wasted.

Therefore I conclude that primary and secondary education should be freely available for all if possible but that further education should not necessarily be wholly free.

(309 words)

140. Most writers of fiction do not earn enough money to live from their writing.
Do you think the government should give them financial assistance to help encourage good literature?

There are some conditions under which a novelist could reasonably expect some government support. In general terms, if the writer has already proved that he or she can write well, and if the stories produced are stimulating and interesting, then I consider that some financial help might be given.

Language quality is difficult to define, but if the writing shows, for example, good grammar, a wide vocabulary, and elegance and imagination, then I can see a valid reason for assisting an author to spend some time free from money problems. Such a writing needs to be encouraged. the entertainment value of a book would be also a factor in deciding whether to provide assistance to an author. Further consideration would include social and educational values expressed in the author's work.

However, if the ideas were socially irresponsible, or if the stories contain unnecessary violence or pornography for its own sake, then I would not want to see the author

sponsored to write stories which do not benefit society. Other exceptions are the many writers of good books who do not require financial help. Books which proved to be extremely popular, such as the Harry Potter stories, clearly need no subsidy at all because the authors have become rich through their writing.

Views on what good quality writing means will vary widely, and so if any author is to be given money for writing, then the decision would have to be made by a committee or panel of judge. An individual opinion would certainly cause disagreement among the reading public.

141. The costs of medical health care are increasing all the time. Governments are finding it difficult to balance the health care budget. Should citizens be totally responsible for their own health costs and take out private health insurance, or is it better to have a comprehensive health care system which provides free health services for all? Discuss.

A much debated issue these days is whether citizens should take out private health insurance or not. The cost of providing free medical care for both the wealthy and the poor is far too great for any government, and most people agree that if you can pay for insurance, you should. In this essay, I will argue that all who can afford it should be insured, but free medical care must be made available for those too poor to do so.

The most important reason for encouraging people to take out private health insurance is the cost to the government of health care. Free health cover for people who are able to pay for it is a waste of public money. Of course, people will only pay health insurance premiums if they know that they are getting good value for their money. If they get sick, they should pay very little or nothing at all. In addition, the privately insured are entitled to special benefits such as having the choice of their own doctors, and being able to avoid long waiting lists for hospital beds.

On the other hand, those who really cannot afford to pay private insurance premiums, which are often very high, are still entitled as citizens to the best medical care available – they cannot be expected to pay their own medical bills. However, if they are working, they should still pay a percentage of their wage (say 1 to 2%) as a tax which pays towards the cost of providing "free" medical services.

In conclusion, most people should privately insure their health, but it is unreasonable to suppose that all citizens can afford it. Therefore, a safety net in the form of a basic free health care system must exist for the very poor and the unemployed.

(300 words)

142. Should governments spend money on art, when they have so many other important issues and concerns?

Art is a basic human need. Governments have a responsibility to spend money on art for their citizens. (Shorter version: 260 words)

Many people's lives are richer because of art - music, paintings, calligraphy, pictures, sculpture, poems and dance. **However**, some people feel that governments should be spending money on housing, medical care, or defence, instead of on art. **This essay will discuss** whether governments should or should not spend money on the arts.

There are several reasons why governments should not finance artists. **First of all**, artists should have to follow the same rules as the rest of the market. If there is a demand for their music or sculpture, then they will be rich. **Secondly**, politicians generally do not have good taste. They will waste public money on popular art or on their own preferences. **But the main reason why governments should minimize spending on the art world** is that there are more important areas like housing, roads, hospitals, and factories which need the money first.

However, it would be wrong to say that governments should not spend any money at all on art. Everybody needs some beauty in their life, but not everyone can afford a Picasso or a piece of music. Governments should provide money for museums or concert halls for everyone. **Another point is that** art allows people to express themselves and this is good for society, culture and thought. **Thirdly**, artists can be good for the economy by producing music, films, and attracting tourists.

All in all, governments **should** prioritize their spending carefully, but they **should also** allocate some of their budget for art. It is part of their duty to society and to future generations.

251 words

Sample 2 :

Throughout the ages, man has tried to create beauty through painting, music, sculpture and other artistic expression. It seems to be a basic need of humans to surround themselves with art. However some people feel that government money spent on art is wasted, particularly when there are so many other demands on it. This essay will examine the conflict between those who say art is important and those who feel it is a waste of money.

It can be wrong for governments to spend large sums of money on art. Too often, governments spend unwisely. They spend money on art not because a picture is good or a museum is needed, but for political reasons. Cities end up with huge statues or empty expensive buildings that are used only by a few people or the elite. Another point is that the artworks are often chosen to represent social or political rather than artistic ideas. The city gets yet another statue of the leader or an ugly monument to national aspirations. A third point is that governments often respond to fashions, and tastes in art can change very rapidly. Without careful advice an expensive collection of worthless paintings or tasteless productions can be the result.

However, it would be wrong to say that governments should not spend any money at all on art. Painters, musicians, and composers cannot survive without financial support. Rich people or large companies do finance art, but then it is often inaccessible to ordinary people. Governments have a duty to make this art available to everyone. However, the most important reason why governments should support the arts is because an appreciation of art is one of the things that makes life worthwhile. Humans do not need just shelter and food. Creative people have always tried to look at things in a new way and to make the world a better place through painting, music, poetry, calligraphy, sculpture, dance, and numerous other forms of expression. While art may not make us immortal, it does make the world a richer place for future generations.

In conclusion, although people do need to be provided with the necessities of life, such as housing and medical care, governments also have a duty to provide their citizens with something more. They should make sure that they pass on beauty, ideas and expression to the next generation and make art available to all instead of being the possession of only the few. I firmly believe that spending money on art is a vital part of a government's responsibility, and I am confident that my country will be able to contribute its share to the richness of the world's art and creativity. (447 words)

143. In the fight against crime, police forces and governments are increasingly using security cameras in public places. Some people are opposed to this, saying that it invades our privacy. What do you think?

Security cameras have become ubiquitous in many countries. Whereas before they appeared only in banks and at high-security areas, they are now entering public places such as malls, streets, stadiums and transport. Many people feel this affects their privacy. This essay will examine whether the advantages of these cameras outweigh their negative impact.

Surveillance cameras have several benefits. An obvious benefit is that the police can catch criminals in the act, thus reducing crime. This will make the streets safer for ordinary people. A more important point is that criminals, particularly young offenders or petty criminals will be deterred. They will not be tempted to carry out crimes, and thus society will be a lot safer. Cameras are also cost-effective and unobtrusive. Authorities do not need to spend large amounts of money on police.

However, security cameras are far from being a perfect solution. The biggest objection concerns privacy. Many people feel that they should be free to travel or move around a shop, mall, street or country without being photographed or recorded. They feel that being watched constantly is like being in a jail, and that ordinary people are losing their freedom because of these devices. Another point is that although the police say that only criminals have something to fear from the cameras, many people do not trust governments with too much information. Corrupt authorities could use information in the wrong way or twist it to victimize some groups. Thirdly, cameras and computers can make mistakes.

In conclusion, although there are definite advantages to using surveillance devices such as cameras, we need to balance the need for security with respect for the individual's privacy and freedom. If we do not trust the members of society, a situation like George Orwell's "1984" could be the result.

297 words

**144. Some governments say how many children a family can have in their country. They may control the number of children someone has through taxes. It is sometimes necessary and right for a government to control the population in this way.
Do you agree or disagree?**

It is certainly very understandable that some governments should start looking at ways of limiting their populations to a sustainable figure. In the past, populations were partly regulated by frequent war and widespread disease, but in recent years the effects of those factors have been diminished. Countries can be faced with a population that is growing much faster than the nation's food resources or employment opportunities and whose members can be condemned to poverty by the need to feed extra mouths. They identify population control as a means to raising living standards.

But how should it be achieved? Clearly, this whole area is a very delicate personal and cultural issue. Many people feel that this is not a matter for the state. They feel this is one area of life where they have the right to make decisions for themselves. For that reason, it would seem that the best approach would be to work by persuasion rather than compulsion. This could be done by a process of education that points out the way a smaller family can mean an improved quality of life for the family members, as well as less strain on the country's perhaps very limited resources.

This is the preferred way. Of course if this does not succeed within a reasonable time scale, it may be necessary to consider other measures, such as tax incentives or child-benefit payments for small families only. These are midway between persuasion and compulsion.

So, yes, it is sometimes necessary, but governments should try very hard to persuade first. They should also remember that this is a very delicate area indeed, and that social engineering can create as many problems as it solves?

COMPUTER

145. Using a computer every day can have more negative than positive effects on your children.

Do you agree or disagree?

I tend to agree that young children can be negatively affected by too much time spent on the computer every day. This is partly because sitting in front of a screen for too long can be damaging to both the eyes and the physical posture of a young child, regardless of what they are using the computer for.

However, the main concern is about the type of computer activities that attract children. These are often electronic games that tend to be very intense and rather violent. The player is usually the 'hero' of the game and too much exposure can encourage children to be self-centred and insensitive to others.

Even when children use a computer for other purposes, such as getting information or emailing friends, it is no substitute for human interaction. Spending time with other children and sharing nonvirtual experiences is an important part of a child's development that cannot be provided by a computer.

In spite of this, the obvious benefits of computer skills for young children cannot be denied. Their adult world will be changing constantly in terms of technology and the Internet is the key to all the knowledge and information available in the world today. Therefore it is important that children learn at an early age to use the equipment enthusiastically and with confidence as they will need these skills throughout their studies and working lives.

I think the main point is to make sure that young children do not overuse computers. Parents must ensure that their children learn to enjoy other kinds of activity and not simply sit at home, learning to live in a virtual world.

(273 words)

146. Some people believe that computers are more a hindrance than a help in today's world. Others feel that they are such indispensable tools that they would not be able to live or work without them.

- **In what ways are computers a hindrance?**
- **What is your opinion?**

The advanced 'Mind machines' so called 'the Computers' are no doubt the best products of latest technology. One cannot imagine the advancement of life and Sciences without these machines.

But like other achievements; they have their own good and bad effects as seen with experience and passage of time. In my opinion they are good if used for educational and beneficial uses for health and living etc.

Basically twentieth century had been famous for its latest Computer techniques and their

application on our lives. Datas shown on Computers help us to assess how much education is conducted through this media. The assessment ways as well as examinations are improved. Moreover personal skills of reading and writing are far more improved through Computers.

Moreover Science and technology progressed immensely with computers. Researchers like cloning and transplants are only possible with modern computerized skills.

Good question comes to ones mind ... where will this Computer would take us next?? Certainly no one knows! We might explore new planners. May be we will buy houses on Moon, Mars or Jupiter. Or we might loose our own identity. One cannot forget the end of 2000 millennium when everybody was in chaos to think what will happen if the computers crash? The aeroplanes were going to crash and the trains would colloid. That Show we are forced to think that one should not be dependent on these machine after all we are humans. We are here to command computers not them to order us.

(249 words)

147. As the world becomes technologically advanced, computers are replacing more and more jobs. Describe some job positions that may be lost because of computers, and discuss at least one problem that may result.

When computers first made their way into the business sector, everyone believed that they would make people's jobs easier. What was not expected was that computers would eliminate jobs. Besides contributing to unemployment, these automated workers often exhibit inadequate job performance.

A number of jobs have been lost as a direct result of new computer technology. Ticket agents in various transportation facilities, from subway/underground stations to airports are virtually nonexistent these days. Bank tellers have been greatly reduced due to automated bank machines. In addition, many call centers/centres that have help lines are almost entirely computerized/computerised. A few years ago I worked as a helper in our local library. Today this position does not exist, because six new computers have been installed. The number of positions lost to computers grows exponentially, and unemployment continues to get worse.

While a computer may easily achieve the main tasks of these jobs, most computers fall short when customers have a unique request or problem. A pre-paid ticket booth does not have insight about the entertainment district and cannot offer friendly directions to a tourist. Similarly, an automated bank machine cannot provide assistance and reassurance to a customer who has just had his credit card stolen. And, more often than not, automated telephone operators cannot answer the one question that we have, and we end up waiting on the line to speak with someone anyway. Every time I go into the library where I worked I notice elderly people who don't know how to use the computers and can't find anyone to help.

In the future, I believe a new business trend will evolve. As computers eliminate jobs, new positions will have to be invented. More and more people will go into business for

themselves, and hopefully put the personal touch back into business. I believe that the human workforce will demonstrate that it is more valuable than computers.

(315 words)

148. Some people say that computers have made life easier and more convenient. Other people say that computers have made life more complex and stressful. What is your opinion? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Some people say that the invention of computers is one of the greatest humankind's inventions. However, other people think that computers make their life more stressful. I agree with those people who think that computers brought many benefits and play a very important role in our modern life.

First of all, every company nowadays uses a computer to store its data and make different kinds of operations. It is very difficult to imagine life without computers. A company would have to store millions of papers and documents. Moreover, a customer would have to wait hours to check his balance or get a piece of information about his transactions at his bank, while an employee was looking through those papers. Another important aspect of this is that people are able to type all their information, make corrections, print or send documents using computers. It makes life much easier. One can spend the rest of the time watching TV with his family or working on something new.

We use computers every day sometimes even not knowing it. When we go to a store and use our credit cards many computers process our information and perform transactions. When we need to get some cash we use money access machines that are computerized too.

Second of all, computers provided a great means of communication - the Internet. I think it is the easiest and cheapest way to get in touch with relatives, friends, business colleagues, etc. Nowadays the world becomes smaller and smaller. When I was a little girl, I could not imagine that it would be possible to communicate with people from all around the world in so easy way. A person can get latest news, become friends with someone from another country, find his old friends, ask for a piece of advice, etc.

Finally, in addition to these practical benefits people can shop without leaving their house. They just use an Internet access, a computer and their cards to make a payment. It is kind of difficult to imagine that a few years ago people had to spend their time in lines buying tickets. Now, a person can choose a destination, company, date and time and get tickets delivered to his door. I think it is amazing.

To sum up, I believe that computers made our lives easier. They change our attitude towards life. I think with the invention of computers people became closer and friendlier.

(404 words)

149. We are becoming increasingly dependent on computers. They are used in businesses, hospitals, crime detection and even to fly planes.

What things will they be used for in the future? Is this dependence on computers a good thing or should we be more suspicious of their benefits?

Computers are a relatively new invention. The first computers were built fifty years ago and it is only in the last thirty or so years that their influence has affected our everyday life. Personal computers were introduced as recently as the early eighties. In this short time they have made a tremendous impact on our lives. We are now so dependent on computers that it is hard to imagine what things would be like today without them. You have only got to go into a bank when their main computer is broken to appreciate the chaos that would occur if computers were suddenly removed world-wide.

In the future computers will be used to create bigger and even more sophisticated computers. The prospects for this are quite alarming. They will be so complex that no individual could hope to understand how they work. They will bring a lot of benefits but they will also increase the potential for unimaginable chaos. They will, for example, be able to fly planes and they will be able to co ordinate the movements of several planes in the vicinity of an airport. Providing all the computers are working correctly nothing can go wrong. If one small program fails disaster.

There is a certain inevitability that technology will progress and become increasingly complex. We should, however, ensure that we are still in a position where we are able to control technology. It will be all too easy to suddenly discover that technology is controlling us. By then it might be too late I believe that it is very important to be suspicious of the benefits that computers will bring and to make sure that we never become totally dependent on a completely technological world.

Sample 2 :

In the last two decades cybernetics have experienced a major breakthrough .This led to the utilization of computers at nearly all parts of our daily life, from personal computers to complicated surgery performing. Surely the uptake of this technology facilitates a lot of difficult tasks but is this excessive dependance ripping the warmth of our lives? In this essay, I will outline how the availability of computers affects our lives.

Most of the daily tasks an individual experiences are time and effort consuming. These two fundamental qualities could be tremendously saved by the use of computers. The average period required to prepare a decent meal for a middle-class family is around an hour to an hour and a half when using traditional methods. This time could be literally reduced to half if computerized devices are used instead. Moreover, a busy businessman is enabled to easily close a profitable deal just with a touch on this highly programmed laptop while enjoying his family vacation and not having to exert an extra effort of traveling long distances just to sign a deal.

On the other hand, new generations are growing remarkably dependent on these modern utilities, which make them handicapped when it comes to preparing a cup of tea. In addition, psychologists suggest that one of the main reasons for suicidal rate increase is recent electric inventions. This is due to that humans by nature stay emotionally healthy through socializing, but due to the importance of modern technology to maintain a

financially satisfying standard of life they gradually isolate themselves. As time passes by each of these individuals gets stuck in a vicious circle of loneliness that eventually leads to suicidal attempts specially among youngsters.

In conclusion, similar to every other invention computers has its benefits and drawbacks, I personally think it all depends upon how we use the given tools . Moderation is the key here to keep the balance and allow us to live in harmony.

Good essay, nice vocabulary, a little too long (340 words instead of 250), a few grammatical mistakes. The topic is not fully covered (what about the “things will they be used for in future” part?).

150. As computers are being used more and more in education, there will be soon no role for teachers in the classroom.

There have been immense advances in technology in most aspects of people's lives, especially in the field of education. Nowadays, an increasing number of students rely on computers to research for information and to produce a perfect paper for school purposes. Others have decided to leave the original way of learning to get knowledge through online schools. These changes in the learning process have brought a special concern regarding the possible decrease of importance of teachers in the classroom.

Some people believe the role of teachers started to fade because computers have been helping some students to progress in their studies quicker than when compared with an original classroom. For example, in the same classroom, students have different intellectual capacities, thus some would be tied to a slow advance in their studies because of others' incapacity of understanding. In this way, pupils could progress in their acquisition of knowledge at their own pace using computers instead of learning from teachers.

However, the presence of a teacher is essential for students because the human contact influences them in positive ways. Firstly, students realize that they are not dealing with a machine but with a human being who deserves attention and respect. They also learn the importance of studying in group and respect other students, which helps them to improve their social skills.

Moreover, teachers are required in the learning process because they acknowledge some student's deficiencies and help them to solve their problems by repeating the same explanation, giving extra exercises or even suggesting a private tutor. Hence, students can have a bigger chance not to fail in a subject.

In conclusion, the role for teachers in the learning process is still very important and it will continue to be in the future because no machine can replace the human interaction and its consequences.

This is a great essay. Looks like Band 8 to me. No improvements are necessary, Keep up the good job!

151. We are becoming increasingly dependent on computers. They are used in businesses, hospitals, crime detection and even to fly planes.

What things will they be used for in the future? Is this dependence on computers a good thing or should we be more suspicious of their benefits?

Computers are a relatively new invention. The first computers were built fifty years ago and it is only in the last thirty or so years that their influence has affected our everyday life. Personal computers were introduced as recently as the early eighties. In this short time they have made a tremendous impact on our lives. We are now so dependent on computers that it is hard to imagine what things would be like today without them. You have only got to go into a bank when their main computer is broken to appreciate the chaos that would occur if computers were suddenly removed world-wide.

In the future computers will be used to create bigger and even more sophisticated computers. The prospects for this are quite alarming. They will be so complex that no individual could hope to understand how they work. They will bring a lot of benefits but they will also increase the potential for unimaginable chaos. They will, for example, be able to fly planes and they will be able to co-ordinate the movements of several planes in the vicinity of an airport. Providing all the computers are working correctly nothing can go wrong. If one small program fails disaster.

There is a certain inevitability that technology will progress and become increasingly complex. We should, however, ensure that we are still in a position where we are able to control technology. It will be all too easy to suddenly discover that technology is controlling us. By then it might be too late I believe that it is very important to be suspicious of the benefits that computers will bring and to make sure that we never become totally dependent on a completely technological world.

Sample 2:

Today computers are used almost everywhere, it is impossible to imagine our life without PCs, Internet, hand phones and other computer devices. It is reasonable that people look to the future of computers. In what field will computers be used for and what role will human have in this world in future?

Besides, computers make our life easier, we can easily get information about any product we plan to buy or place we plan to visit over a second using personal computer and Internet. Scientists predict that in the nearest future it will be possible to smell a new perfume using Internet and watch 3D scenes at home like we do in the theater. According to forecasts of HR agencies machines will replace jobs of cashiers, civil and military pilots. Some corporations in Japan already selling housewife-robots, which help old people to keep their home clean.

Despite the fact that computers help us, they make us dependent. Apparently, people spend more time behind monitors than ever before. And some of them feel a need for more time to be spent with people in live contact. In addition, failure of one of the important modules of specific computer can entail serious consequences. Suffice to mention computer problem, occurred in the end of 1990s, problem concerned with coming year 2000 (Y2K) and catastrophes that were predicted. Fortunately imminent disasters did not happen. However, it is difficult to imagine what could be if all the predictions had occurred.

We live in technological era, computers penetrated everywhere with all benefits they provide and all dangers they hide. However we are satisfied with them and sometimes we

even thank them because they help us in communicating, studying, doing business, entertaining and saving lives in critical situations.

TRAFFIC

152. Traffic and housing problems in major cities could be solved by moving large companies and factories and their employees to the countryside. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

These days with increasing urban populations, there are major problems with congestion and not only the price, but also availability of accommodation in large cities of the world. It seems that one possible solution could be to relocate large companies and factories as well as their respective employees out of these urban areas and into more rural ones. In my opinion, I strongly agree that this would have a desired effect in making cities more livable.

To begin with, the traffic problem in cities doesn't only exist from commuting employees, but also the general public travelling around the city. While this may be a fact, if the number of worker's vehicles is reduced on city streets, a large percentage of traffic will obviously decline in rush hours. For example, peak hour traffic is undoubtedly made up largely of staff from companies going to and from home.

Secondly, in regards to housing problems, populations will always continue to grow in cities and therefore inadvertently decrease the number of cheap and available apartments. This is certainly obvious, however, a large proportion of these apartments are occupied by employees from large firms and their families. If this workforce is relocated to housing estates in the country, city apartment blocks will fall in price and certainly increase in availability.

In conclusion, by relocating workers to rural areas to work and reside, heavy traffic conditions and lack of adequate accommodation in city centres will obviously change for the better. As far as I'm concerned, I agree that the government should enforce such a law in order to increase our standard of living in our hectic city life.

(272 words)

153. Every day traffic seems to get worse on our roads. How can we reduce the number of cars on our roads today? What alternatives can we offer car drivers?

The more people that there are in the world, the more cars there are on the road. People are richer too and often families have more than one car. It has been proved that building more roads does not work; it just encourages more traffic.

So, what can we do? People like their cars and the freedom and independence that cars give them. One possibility would be to raise car taxes and fuel taxes so that people do not want to spend the extra money. Taxes on new car sales as well could be increased in order to discourage people from buying. Perhaps a used car sales tax could be introduced too. In the same way motorways could have tolls charged for using them although this may just increase congestion on smaller roads as people try and avoid the motorways. The government that introduces such ideas will not be popular though and would probably lose power. Governments would therefore be unlikely to set up such new

measures.

I think it would be better to try and change people's attitudes and offer them alternatives. Educate them more about the pollution and waste that they are causing. Persuade them to car share, use public transport or even cycle if the distances are not too long. Countries such as Holland and Denmark are well known for how their citizens are passionate about green issues and how they use bicycles when they can.

Reducing traffic is a difficult task. I don't think it is possible realistically to reduce car numbers but I do think that we can change people's attitudes and get them to use different ways of travelling.

(275 words)

Sample 2 :

Traffic Congestion in Abu Dhabi

Abu Dhabi is a modern city but also has a modern problem: traffic jams. In the early mornings, and again in the evening, around 8 pm, the streets are crowded with cars, taxis, and trucks. This essay will explain **the causes of** gridlock in Abu Dhabi and discuss **the effects of** this problem.

Abu Dhabi's traffic problems **stem from** several causes. The rapid economic growth of the emirate **has enabled** most residents to buy their own cars. **This has put intense pressure** on the road system, which although it is highly developed, has **not been able to keep up** with the expansion in population. **Another cause is** the absence of any major public transport system such as buses or trains. **Because of this**, residents rely on hordes of taxis, **thus** adding to the congestion. **Yet another contributing factor** is the layout of the island. This limits road construction.

The **resulting** gridlock has **several adverse effects**. **First of all** is the frustration and anger felt by road-users. This **can result in** tension and accidents, and, ironically, emergency vehicles may not even be able to reach the scene of such accidents. **Another effect is** the waste of time spent in traffic. **This** lowers productivity at work and contributes to reduced time at school and with family. **There are also** additional costs to the city in terms of air pollution and unnecessary fuel consumption. Shopping and daily errands become more of a chore, and the city suffers.

Commuters and road-users will need to cooperate with municipal authorities as they introduce measures to reduce congestion. However, Abu Dhabi has shown its ability to rise to challenges in the past, and most residents are confident that the city will still be an attractive place to live as the problem of traffic is addressed.

COUNTRY

154. Should wealthy nations be required to share their wealth among poorer nations by providing such things as food and education? Or is it the responsibility of the governments of poorer nations to look after their citizens themselves?

I think wealthy nations should be required to share their wealth among poorer nations. But their helping should only stop at providing such things as food and education because of three following reasons.

Firstly, citizens of both wealthy nations and poorer nations are human beings. Therefore, we can not look at, hear of, and talk about people who lack food, education, etc... without compassion and sympathy. Sharing wealth among poorer nations is not only a good deed but also a task itself.

Secondly, many nations in Africa and Asia are very very poor. Famine, diseases, crime and illiteracy are killing their citizens. In the contrary, a lot of nations in Europe and America are too rich. If there are no actions taken, this inequality will increase dramatically. Poor countries will become more and more poorer while rich countries will become more and more richer. As a result, poorest countries will be slaves of richest countries. So, sharing wealth is an useful way to prevent people from that bad future.

Thirdly, although sharing wealth among poorer nations is very necessary but this helping should only stop at providing such things as food, medicine and education. Or else, poor nations may depend on aid. They won't have enthusiasm to build their countries by themselves. Moreover, rich nations can take advantage of sharing wealth to interfere deeply in poor nations' governments. This can't be considered humane action and should be prevented.

In my opinion, sharing wealth among poorer nations has both bad side and good side. What we have to do is avoiding its bad side and practicing its good side.

This is an excellent essay, your arguments are convincing and very well presented. There are only a few minor mistakes, read and consider the comments. Very well done!

155. Improvements in health, education and trade are essential for the development of poorer nations. However, the governments of richer nations should take more responsibility for helping the poorer nations in such areas.

Today's world has been divided into developing and industrialised countries which the main difference between them is the amount of money that governments apply in important sectors such as education, health and commerce. Most of the poorer nations are buried in debts as a result of their unbalanced finances which are reflected in a failed health care, an unstructured education system and a weak international trade. This vicious cycle will continue indefinitely unless wealthier nations show interest in minimizing the worldwide economic differences, as well as taking more responsibility for assisting unfortunate countries.

Most of the African countries live in sub-human conditions because of the extreme poverty, upheaval, hunger, disease, unemployment, lack of education and both inexperienced and corrupt administrations. The devastating consequences of the AIDS epidemic in those countries could improve if the infected populations receive free drugs to control the disease, have access to health professionals and get information on how to prevent its spread. But this can only be achieved through international help programs in which leaders of the world's richest countries donate medicine and also send doctors and nurses to treat and educate those in need.

Moreover, most of the poor countries rely on selling agricultural products and raw material to rich nations and buying industrialized products from them resulting in a huge financial deficit. Consequently, they borrow a significant amount of money from the World Bank to try to improve their broken economies, but sometimes the money disappears with no significant changes and they cannot even pay the interest to the bank. Regarding this issue, last year the G8, which is comprised of leaders of the eight richest nations, decided to forgive billions of dollars worth of debt owed by the world's poorest nations. In addition, they developed adequate loan programs to financially assist those countries.

In conclusion, leaders of the industrialised countries play an indispensable role in assisting developing nations deal with essential areas such as health, education and trade. Also, their aid is the key to breaking the vicious cycle, which results in poverty and death.

This is an amazing essay, looks like Band 8 to me, nothing to improve here.

156. The wealth gap between 1st world countries and 3rd world countries seems to be increasing. How can we reduce this gap? Do you think that developed countries have a duty to assist developing countries in every way?

Every day the rich countries in the world get richer and the poor countries get poorer. Can we reduce this gap? Of course we can. The question is whether the people in power want to do it?

Reducing the wealth gap can be achieved by cancelling third world debt, cancelling trade and farming subsidies so that third world countries can compete, getting rid of third world corruption and investing and building in third world countries using local people and skills and allowing them ownership of businesses. There are other things as well. Unfortunately there is no profit in business for first world countries to do these things. Some will do them but most will not. The ordinary man on the street wants things to be better for poorer countries and the politicians say that they will help but the politicians will in the end do what business tells them to do. Politicians also rightly feel they have a duty to protect their own countries and keeping economically dominant is part of this duty. Creating effective competition for their own country's businesses is not part of what they are expected to do.

This then leads on to whether I believe that developed countries have a duty to help the developing countries. Yes, I do. As an individual I believe that we have a duty to assist the poorer countries with their development in all aspects. We can provide teachers and education and doctors on the small scale and on the larger scale the things that I have talked about in the previous paragraph. Can we do this? Yes. Will we do this? See the previous paragraph again.

In conclusion you can see that I believe that there is a split between what would happen in a perfect world and what actually happens. We have a duty to reduce the wealth gap between developed and developing countries and we can do it, but it is unlikely that this will happen quickly.

(329 words)

157. Should rich countries help poorer ones?

Or does it only help the rich country by keeping the poorer country dependent?

Today, the world is becoming more and more closely linked. Trade has increased and the movement of people between countries is greater than ever before. However, billions of people still live in poverty, and in many places, the gap between rich and poor is widening. This essay will look at the arguments for and against helping poor countries.

There are many reasons for helping poor countries. First of all, there are humanitarian reasons. Like individuals who give to charity, many countries feel it is their religious, social, or moral duty to help people in other countries who are suffering from famine, drought, war, or disease. However, many rich countries also donate money for political or diplomatic reasons. They want to maintain a relationship of dependency with the recipient, or simply to influence the government and direction of the country. A further reason why many countries help poorer ones is for economic reasons. The donors may want to control the supply of commodities such as oil, water, or wheat. Alternatively, the richer country may want to ensure markets for their own products, whether these are planes, computers or shoes.

However, aid is not necessarily the best way to help a country. For one thing, billions of dollars of aid often goes missing, into corrupt governments or inefficient administration. A second point is that many foreign aid projects are unsuitable for the target country. Many agencies build huge dams or industrial projects that fail after a few years or that do not involve the local people. Furthermore, much aid returns to the donor. This can be in the form of expensive specialized equipment and experts from the donor country.

There are many other ways we can help poor countries. Opening up trade barriers, so that poor countries can sell their goods is one way. Another is to remove subsidies so that imported goods from poorer countries can compete fairly. A third method is to forgive debts. Many poor countries have huge interest repayments on old loans.

The needs of the poorer countries may seem obvious. However, although our humanity makes us want to help eliminate poverty and suffering, we must examine the real needs of poor countries and implement solutions that will benefit both them and us.

LEISURE

158. Some people think that it is important to use leisure time for activities that improve the mind, such as reading and doing word puzzles. Other people feel that it is important to rest the mind during leisure time.

It is generally accepted that we all need leisure time to recover from the stresses of work and everyday life.

Personally, I prefer to be active during this time, as I think this suits me better. However, what we do with our leisure time is up to us and no one can say that any particular activity is the best.

Some people relax by watching movies, reading or surfing the internet. People who have physically demanding jobs may choose these types of activities. If you are a nurse or builder, you may feel that you don't want to do a five-kilometre run after work, because you are already physically tired.

Other people do very sedentary jobs. Computer analysts, for example, may spend all day sitting in front of a computer screen. At the end of the working day, they may be keen to stretch their limbs and improve their health by swimming or going to the gym.

Another factor that influences our choice of leisure pursuit is where we work. People who work indoors often prefer outdoor hobbies, whereas for people who work outdoors, the reverse may be true. I am a student myself and this involves a lot of sitting in lectures, so I need to get out into the fresh air afterwards.

In any situation, the important thing is that people need to stay healthy by choosing what is best for them. The only wrong way to spend free time, in my view, is to have a sedentary job and then go home and watch television.

159. Some people prefer to plan activities for their free time very carefully. Others choose not to make any plans at all for their free time. Compare the benefits of planning free-time activities with the benefits of not making plans. Which do you prefer - planning or not planning for your leisure time? Use specific reasons and examples to explain your choice.

Nowadays people have so many things to do that they almost always do not have enough time for it. When we go to bed we carefully think and plan our next day and it continues day in and day out. We wake up, recollect our checklist with things to do and in a few minutes we are already in a car on our way to the office. Often people do not have time for themselves. So, when people have some spare time they want to use it wisely. Some people prefer to plan activities for their free time very carefully. However, others prefer not to make any plans. In this essay I will analyze both cases and present my view in favor of planning free-time activities.

From the one side, not making any plans and just letting the time pass by for some time have some benefits. First of all, a person can just relax, enjoy the beautiful moments, spend his or her time with loved ones, watch a movie, listen to relaxing music, observe the flowers in bloom from the window, contemplate about his or her life and just slow

down the pace of life. I think it is a very good way to eliminate one's stress and tension and just leave all troubles and worries behind.

From the other side, careful planning can bring many benefits too. First of all, one can travel. However, traveling requires some planning to be made. For example, one most likely will need a hotel room. So, the reservation should be made beforehand. Also, it is wise to check one's car to avoid breakdowns and have an uninterrupted worry-free trip. Second of all, planning one's activities allows to spend one's free time the way he/she likes. For instance, if I want to play tennis on incoming week-end I will certainly make a reservation for a court because in this case I will not be disappointed with the waste of my time. Personally, I prefer to make plans for my free time because it allows me to spend my vacation or week-ends the way I want it.

To sum up, I think careful planning allows people to derive maximum benefits from their free time. However, I must confess sometimes I allow my self just to stay at home with my friends and family and not make any plans. (394 words)

ECONOMIC

**160. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
Businesses should do anything they can to make a profit.
Use specific reasons and examples to support your position.**

I do not agree with the statement that businesses should do anything they can to make a profit. I state my opinion on the following points.

First of all, every company must have its moral code. It means that a company should treat its clients properly and respect their rights. Of course a company may lose a part of its profit but security of its clients must be on the first place. Otherwise, clients will switch to another company and never be back. For instance, a few years ago "Jonson&Jonson" produced a new type of painkillers. Unfortunately, this product was not tested properly. As a result of this many people died and received injuries. The president of the company made a crucial decision to call back all painkillers from all distributors and pay to all injured customers for their treatment. It cost a lot of money for the company but it saved its image and clients. It was a very difficult decision, but the president of the company understood that it would cost him even more in the future because he would not be able to return clients' respect. Loosing customers means for a company loosing its profit.

Second of all, in order to succeed in the modern world companies have to compete with each other. Many companies lose their profit decreasing prices on their products. They do not aspire for extra profit but for clients' satisfaction. Companies do it because they want their products sold and their customers satisfied. They offer discounts, free delivery, free service, free Internet access, good return service, etc. All these are done to make their old customers happy and attract new clients.

To sum up, I think a company, which the only goal is profit will not succeed nowadays. Otherwise, companies that respect their clients and want to see them satisfied will make a fortune.

(311 words)

YOUR OPINION & HOWNTOWN & COUNTRY

161. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of having a car.

Nowadays, as roads are becoming more and more crowded, people are considering both the advantages and disadvantages of having a car before they buy one.

The main advantage of the car is that it gives the freedom to travel when and where you want, without being limited to fixed routes and timetables. What is more, you can carry several passengers and as much luggage as you like, at no extra cost. In addition to this, you can travel in comfort in a car, with a seat to yourself and the possibility of comforts such as a music system and air conditioning.

On the other hand, owning a car is very expensive. As well as the price of the car, the cost of tax, insurance, petrol and repairs must also be considered before buying. Moreover, the increase in traffic means that drivers are spending more and more time stuck in traffic jams. Perhaps the major disadvantage of cars in general is the huge damage that they do to human life and to the environment, and all motorists much accept that they are making a small contribution to this.

To sum up, provided you have access to an efficient public transport system, then buying and running your own car could be considered an expensive luxury.

(213 words)

162. Research indicates that the characteristics we are born with have much more influence on our personality and development than any experiences we may have in our life.

Which do you consider to be the major influence?

Today the way we consider human psychology and mental development is heavily influenced by the genetic sciences. We now understand the importance of inherited characteristics more than ever before. Yet we are still unable to decide whether an individual's personality and development are more influenced by genetic factors (nature) or by the environment (nurture).

Research, relating to identical twins, has highlighted how significant inherited characteristics can be for an individual's life. But whether these characteristics are able to develop within the personality of an individual surely depends on whether the circumstances allow such a development. It seems that the experiences we have in life are so unpredictable and so powerful, that they can boost or over-ride other influences, and there seems to be plenty of research findings to confirm this.

My own view is that there is no one major influence in a person's life. Instead, the traits we inherit from our parents and the situation and experiences that we encounter in life are constantly interacting. It is the interaction of the two that shapes a person's personality and dictates how that personality develops. If this were not true, we would be able to

predict the behavior and character of a person from the moment they were born.

In conclusion, I do not think that either nature or nurture is the major influence on a person, but that both have powerful effects. How these factors interact is still unknown today and they remain largely unpredictable in a person's life.

(249 words)

**163. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement?
A person should never make an important decision alone.
Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.**

From my everyday experience and observation I can claim that discussion of an important decision with other people bring many benefits. In the following paragraphs I will give my reasons to defend this statement.

First of all, different people have different opinions. In order to make the right choice people should discuss every possible decision and its consequences. Making an important decision alone can bring many negative aspects. For instance, a person can reveal his selfishness or impatience and the consequences of that decision can affect many people in the future. I think that a good and wise decision can be born only in discussion because people can share their knowledge and experiences a look at the problem from different sides and aspects.

Second of all, I think that making decision alone is unacceptable especially for a company. Imagine that a chief makes the decision about increasing a production line without discussing it with his employees. In this case a part of company's profit will be spending on extended purchase of raw materials. So, share holders will be left without dividends. This decision may lead to getting rid of company's shares and as a result of this declining the value of a company as a whole.

To sum up, I think that a person should always consult his relatives or colleges when making an important decision to avoid possible mistakes.

(230 words)

**164. You have decided to give several hours of your time each month to improve the community where you live.
What is one thing you will do to improve your community? Why?
Use specific reasons and details to explain your choice.**

I think the question what would I do if I had a chance to improve my community is difficult. I have in my mind many things, the improvement of which will make our community better

place to live but they all require the participation of many people and, moreover, they require investments, which I can not provide. For example, my community is quite noisy. We have the huge mall just in front of our community, so traffic jams are very common for this place. I think that the construction of a few pass-by roads will benefit all people who live here as well as people who drive by every day.

Unfortunately, the question is what I can do for my community giving a few hours of my time every month. I think I can not do much, but I still can help someone in my community. For example, I can baby-sit. I know a couple of families with little children, who can not afford to spend much money on the baby-sitter. One of these families is a single mom with a little girl. Julia, this is her name, is a waitress in a restaurant. She is a great person and we became close friends. So, sometimes I offer her help with her child when she has to work in the evenings. Another family has two funny little twins. One time their parents asked me to babysit their children because they had to attend an unexpected presentation.

I think this kind of help brings many benefits to my community. First of all, people become friendlier. For example, those families, which I mentioned above, became friends after I introduced them to each other. Second of all, people get to know each other and feel more secure in their houses and apartments. Finally, I am ready to help those people because I am sure that they will help me too. One time I lost the keys from my car and Julia offered me her car for a while.

To sum up, I believe that baby-sitting is a great way to help my community in many aspects.

(353 words)

165. If you could change one important thing about your hometown, what would you change?

Use reasons and specific examples to support your answer.

If I could change one thing about my hometown, I think it would be the fact that there's no sense of community here. People don't feel connected, they don't look out for each other, and they don't get to know their neighbors.

People come and go a lot here. They change jobs frequently and move on. This means that they don't put down roots in the community. They don't join community organizations and they're not willing to get involved in trying to improve the quality of life. If someone has a petition to put in a new street light, she has a very hard time getting a lot of people to sign. They don't feel it has anything to do with them. They don't get involved in improving the schools because they don't think the quality of education is important to their lives. They don't see the connection between themselves and the rest of their community.

People don't try to support others around them. They don't keep a friendly eye on their children, or check in on older folks if they don't see them for a few days. They're not aware when people around them may be going through a hard time. For example, they may not know if a neighbor loses a loved one. There's not a lot of community support for

individuals.

Neighbors don't get to know each other. Again, this is because people come and go within a few years. So when neighbors go on vacation, no one is keeping an eye on their house. No one is making sure nothing suspicious is going on there, like lights in the middle of the night. When neighbors' children are cutting across someone's lawn on their bikes, there's no friendly way of casually mentioning the problem. People immediately act as if it's a major property disagreement.

My hometown is a nice place to live in many ways, but it would be much nice if we had that sense of community.

**166. A foreign visitor has only one day to spend in your country.
Where should this visitor go on that day? Why?
Use specific reasons and details to support your choice.**

Traveling is a good way to find out more about different countries with different traditions and customs. Some travelers prefer to spend in one country just a few days or one day and then leave for another country. This way of traveling allows people to visit more countries in fewer days. Unfortunately, in this case such travelers have to hurry in order to visit more places.

I am from Saint-Petersburg, Russia. So, if a foreign visitor has only one day to spend in my country I think I would advice him to visit the "Hermitage" - the most well known and amazing museum in Russia. The "Hermitage" has 3 floors and more then 100 halls. It is really amazing to visit that place. Many people from all over the world every day enter its walls. Some of the rooms devoted to the history of other countries. Others devoted to the art of a famous painter and the history of his life. However, most of the halls conclude many things such as paintings, royal belongings, sculptures from Russian history.

Some people say that it is impossible to feel deeply and see all these amazing historical values for one visit. I have to completely agree with this statement. When I first visited the "Hermitage" I was 14 years old. It impressed me so much that I was back next day to see what I had not been able to see the day before.

The "Hermitage" is an impressive and beautiful museum. I think it is worth to spend there a whole day and I believe that after that a foreign visitor can claim with a proud that he or she saw Russia.

(280 words)

VALUE

167. Successful sports professionals can earn a great deal more money than people in other important professions. Some people think this is fully justified while others think it is unfair. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

As a result of constant media attention, sports professionals in my country have become stars and celebrities, and those at the top are paid huge salaries. Just like movie stars, they live extravagant lifestyles with huge houses and cars.

Many people find their rewards unfair, especially when comparing these super salaries with those of top surgeons or research scientists, or even leading politicians who have the responsibility of governing the country. However, sports salaries are not determined by considering the contribution to society a person makes, or the level of responsibility he or she holds. Instead, they reflect the public popularity of sport in general and the level of public support that successful stars can generate. So the notion of 'fairness' is not the issue.

Those who feel that sports stars' salaries are justified might argue that the number of professionals with real talent are very few, and the money is a recognition of the skills and dedication a person needs to be successful. Competition is constant and a player is tested every time they perform in their relatively short career. The pressure from the media is intense and there is little privacy out of the spotlight. So all of these factors may justify the huge earnings.

Personally, I think that the amount of money such sports stars make is more justified than the huge earnings of movie stars, but at the same time, it indicates that our society places more value on sport than on more essential professions and achievements.

168. It is generally agreed that society benefits from the work of its members. Compare the contributions of artists to society with the contributions of scientists to society. Which type of contribution do you think is valued more by your society? Give specific reasons to support your answer.

From my everyday experience and observation I think that artists as well as scientists bring many benefits to society. It is a controversial question whether the contributions of artists are more or less than the contributions of scientists to the society. For several reasons, which I will mention below, I think that both types are valuable, priceless and irreplaceable for every society.

The contributions of artists to the society are very essential. Art can form person's spiritual sense, their views and personalities. People learn history, the traditions of their country through the art. We also watch movies that entertain and at the same time extend our range of interests. Another important aspect of this is that art is an ancient means of communication. In old times people depicted the herds of mammoths on the walls of their caves. They performed different rituals around the fireplace asking their gods for health, good harvest and weather. Our language is a result of people's need to communicate.

From the other side, the contribution of scientists is could not be exaggerated. All humankind is indebted to the scientists because of their work and achievements. Scientists make our life easier. We have cars and airplanes to move fast from one place to another. We have microwaves and a bunch of preprocessed food to make the cooking much easier. We have different devices that simplify all we do. Finally, scientists are making great achievements in medicine that make our life longer and happier. Nowadays people have a great opportunity to do many things faster by use of computers.

To sup up, I believe that artists nourish our souls when scientists and technology feed our minds. So, we can not eliminate or underestimate one of them.

**169. People who have original ideas are of much greater value to society than those who are simply able to copy the ideas of others well.
To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?**

I certainly agree that people who come up with new ideas; in other words those who 'invent' or 'discover' things are terribly important to society as a whole. However, I also think there is a role in society for good imitators.

No one would deny that key individuals must be thanked for providing us with certain facilities that we use every day. Where, would we be, for example, without basic items such as the washing machine, the television and, more recently, the computer? These items are now used so regularly that we tend to take them for granted.

In fact, the society we live in today has become increasingly consumer-oriented, and while it may be possible to constantly update and improve consumer goods, not everyone where I live can afford the prices of these innovations. Furthermore not everyone lives in an area that has accessibility to the latest models on the market. For this reason, there is a value to be placed on being able to provide good copies of expensive items.

Having said that, certain innovations have a more serious impact on our lives than consumer goods and cannot easily be replicated. Vital medicines like penicillin and vaccines against dangerous diseases also exist because people made continual efforts to develop them. Scientific ideas such as these enable us to live longer and escape illness.

(225 words)